LIBRARY OF THE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PRINCETON, N. J.

PRESENTED BY

Princeton University Library

BR 157 .B46 1867 v.4
Bennett, William J. E. 1804-
1886.
The church's broken unity
v. 4

The Church's Broken Unity.

CHIEFLY REPRINTED FROM THE "OLD CHURCH PORCH."

ON

ROMANISM.

(I.)

BY

REV. W. J. E. BENNETT,

VICAR OF FROOME-SELWOOD.

LONDON:

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE, S.W.

NEW YORK: POTT AND AMERY,

SWIFT AND CO., REGENT PRESS, 55, KING STREET,
REGENT STREET, W.

Miss Griffiths.

Xmas 1879.

From Mary.

Romanism.

ROMANISM.

CHAPTER I.

In reviewing the various sects which exist around us, it has been shown that the many schisms and heresies which have unhappily divided the Church of Christ in England, are no proof against her inherent vitality and truth. With a sorrowful confession that our people have indeed been rent asunder by a multitude of creeds, we compare our present state with the history of the Universal Church even from the time of our Blessed Lord; and finding it was the same, we conclude that since the "truth as it is in Jesus" is no way in itself compromised by the dissensions of its professors; so neither is the truth of the Church of England lost because of the multitude of schismatics springing forth from her bosom.

But we must not shut our eyes against the fact that in addition to the Sectarians, whose names and doctrines have hitherto occupied our attention, there is a further and a wider schism

between ourselves as holding the title of the Catholic Church in England, and another body of religionists, who, claiming a descent from the See of Rome, hold forth a similar claim to be the Church of Christ. Those sects of whom we have spoken as yet, are well known to the commonest reader of history as mere modern emanations from the doctrine of private judgment so freely tolerated among us since the Reformation. Hold forth the principle that every man may choose for himself any creed he pleases upon his own interpretation of the Bible, and the consequence is inevitable. There will be nearly as many opinions as men. Schism is the certain fruit of private judgment so misused. The sects of England have sprung from this perversion of it. They glory in their freedom of restraint from any of the chains of tradition or of creed which bind the Catholic Church. They disclaim apostolicity of descent. They value not the name of Catholic. They are reckless of unity. But that great portion of sincere, though, as we think, mistaken men who are adherents of the Bishop of Rome; that great class of religionists whom we call *Romanists;* refusing to join in the worship of the Church, or receive the Sacraments at the hands of the Catholic clergy of England, establish themselves on a foundation totally distinct from the sects of the Reformation. Their idea is that they hold n themselves what no other body of men can

hold, the keys of divine truth, the apostolical descent, and the bond of unity. Those keys, they assert, can be given alone by the occupant of the See of S. Peter; that apostolical descent, they maintain, can only come to the Church through the Bishop of Rome; and that bond of unity they disclaim as by any possibility existing, except through communion with themselves. Hence their boldness in these later times, since the restraints of law have been removed, in setting up their new altars against the ancient Altars of the Church, and their reckless determination to bring forward new bishops of their own, to whom, contrary to the canons, they go through the schismatic form of appointing Sees. Hence through all the great towns of our country, we now behold rival Bishops, rival Priests, and rival Sacraments, by which the faith of the single-minded is of course disturbed and perverted. And therefore here again, still more awfully and still more wickedly, is the Church's Broken Unity set before the world. The sects of the Reformation may be said to err in ignorance; but the schism of the followers of the Bishop of Rome is a violation of Church order through a wilful triumph over facts of history and Catholic rule.

Here then we come to a totally new field for our discussion. What is this party in the Church of which we speak; these dividers and renders in twain of Christ's Body? How did they arise

among us? How comes it that when the Bishops of the Church hold the same sees and titles as have been among the people of England for ten, twelve, or fourteen centuries; with the tenure of the very same Churches; with worship at the very same Altars; with Sacraments duly administered according to the canons of the Universal Church; numbers of men should arise, and with open demonstration of a foreign interference with our ecclesiastical affairs, claim the title, to the exclusion of ourselves, of the Catholic Church? How has it come to pass that a Bishop beyond the seas should send among the people of England, as he now does so openly, Bishops, Priests, and other officers of his Church, who, however validly they may exercise their jurisdiction in the countries subject to that Bishop, have no canonical power here; but on the contrary, violating the whole tenor of the Ecumenical Councils of the undivided Church, are therefore by those Councils guilty of schism.

There cannot by any possibility be two Churches in one country. Either that body of religionists which adheres to the Bishop of Rome, and therefore bears the name of Roman Catholics, or Romanists, is guilty of a schism; or that body of religionists which bears the name of Anglo-Catholics, or Anglicans, is guilty of a schism: they cannot by any possibility both be right. Charity, brotherly affection for fellow Christians, sorrow at the line of separation

drawn so unhappily between us ; grief at beholding so much zeal, earnestness, and devotion, exercised among our people at their hands; admiration at the great sanctity and self-denial which we witness among them ; all this is within our hearts, as we look out and behold what we do. But we cannot both be right. It is impossible, devise any theory that we please, that we should both simultaneously be THE CHURCH. Hence the vital importance of ascertaining the ground on which we respectively stand. "The Church's Broken Unity" bursts upon us in this great schism more vividly, with deeper wounds, and more heart-rending sorrow than in any one of those minor divisions which we have hitherto lamented, and therefore the necessity the more fully to investigate its causes.

This we must now do. Gladly would we shut our eyes and be at peace, but truth must prevail over all things. Gladly would we pass by and be silent, but the infidel openly derides our unhappy division, and through the bitterness of our discord the faith of JESUS perishes.

Therefore, to take the matter at the very root, we must first enter upon a history of facts. What is the account given us of the Church as first established in our native land? When, and by what means, did Christianity first arise in Great Britain? Upon these facts, duly ascertained, will the truth of our respective positions ultimately depend.

The people of Great Britain, or the British Islands, or, as they were sometimes called, the "Islands of the Western Ocean," were originally, with the rest of the whole world, lying in heathenism and idolatry. Julius Cæsar passing through Gaul invaded them with his victorious armies, and after many battles subdued them. This was in the sixtieth year before the time of our Blessed LORD. Some slight civilization, as of necessity arising from the connection of a savage people with the polished Romans, must have been the result; but as both the nations were equally destitute of the Revelation of GOD, there could have been nothing further. Claudius, however, in the year of our LORD 46, or from that period to A.D. 51, repeated this invasion, and thence, as it would appear from a careful study of dates and facts, there began an opening for the light of our Blessed SAVIOUR among the savage and heathen tribes of Great Britain. Caractacus, son of Bran, a Bard or Priest of the Druid religion, became a leading Prince among the Britons. He summoned the people around him, became their General and King, and for nine years in various pitched battles defied the Roman power. At length he was conquered, taken prisoner, and sent with all his family, as was the custom of the Romans in their victories, to make his submission at Rome. Now it was just at this time, or shortly after, *i.e.* during the captivity of Caractacus, that the Apostle S. Paul,

in the course of his preaching to the Gentiles, visited Rome. The Apostle speaks highly of the converts to the Christian faith at that time, for he says, that the faith of the Roman saints was even then "spoken of throughout the world," (Rom. i. 8); and that there were "saints in Cæsar's household." (Phil. iv. 22.) It accords with all tradition that at this time Caractacus, and his father, Bran, became converts to the Christian faith. It is said in the Welsh Triads, which are ancient records, giving in a sort of mystic poetry the principal events of the British history, that there were :

"Three holy families of the Isle of Britain.

"The first, the family of Bran the blessed, and Bran brought the faith of CHRIST first into this island from Rome, where he had been in prison."

And there were three sovereigns of the Isle of Britain, who conferred blessings on the people.

I. "Bran the blessed, who first brought the faith of CHRIST to the nation of the Cymry from Rome, where he had been seven years a hostage for his son Caradog, (Caractacus)."*

A son and daughter of Caractacus are also mentioned as converts to the faith at the same time, and the daughter is identified, under the name of Claudia, with the saints whom S. Paul mentions in the second Epistle to Timothy, written from Rome.

* The Triads. Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry. —(Welsh).

The Apostle says: "Eubulus greeteth thee, and Pudens, and Linus, and Claudia." (2 Tim. iv. 21.) This Claudia is alluded to by the Roman poet Martial, as married to an illustrious Roman who was called Rufus. She took the name of Claudia, as was the custom, from the Emperor Claudius; and being married to Rufus, was called by the poet Martial, Claudia Rufina. But Rufus himself, so called by S. Paul in the Epistle of the Romans: "Salute Rufus chosen in the LORD," (Rom. xvi. 13,) was afterwards, on account of his modesty and gentleness, called *Pudens*. This identifies the Claudia of Martial with the Christian convert married to Pudens, and joined together in the salutation of S. Paul.*

But this is not all. There is record of another British lady, who became Christian at the same time, Pomponia Græcina; she became the wife of Aulus Plautius, the lieutenant of the Emperor Claudius, and then Roman Governor in Britain. She is described by the Roman historian Tacitus as guilty of a "foreign superstition." This was Christianity. She was probably one of S. Paul's converts, and included in his account of the "saints of Cæsar's household."

Here then is a slight glimmering of the light of the SON of GOD as it first beamed among the ancient British people. As to any direct mission

* See this very beautifully told in "Chronicles of the Ancient British Church," p. 33. Stillingfleet also mentions it, and also Fuller, "Church History."

among the people, various are the traditions, but all are enveloped in uncertainty. Some assert that the Gospel was first preached in Britain by S. Peter, others by S. Philip, others give S. John, Simon Zelotes, and Joseph of Arimathea. All however seem to rest on no solid foundation, and are to be set aside as fables.* While on the contrary the larger tradition, that S. Paul, as he was the great Apostle of the Gentiles, so was he also the Apostle of Great Britain, has obtained the greater credit. Bishop Stillingfleet, after a

* I should be very glad to indulge in the popular tradition of Joseph of Arimathea, and his foundation of the monastery of Glastonbury, which, if verified, would make the British Church one of the earliest in Christendom. But truth forbids it. The tradition is, that Joseph, accompanied by Lazarus, Mary Magdalene, and Martha, with many other holy persons, travelled towards Britain, and after many difficulties, received from Arviragus, then king of that part of Britain, a grant of land: and that upon this site, the Island of Avalon, now Glastonbury, the first church ever reared in Britain was founded. Bishop Stillingfleet has carefully examined all the authorities on this point, and after a long discussion has pronounced it a fable. The mere fact that Gildas, the first British historian; Bede, Asserius, Marianus Scotus, and other historians of our early annals, take no notice whatever of such an event, at once condemns it. The tradition seems merely to rest upon accounts put forth in Norman times by the monks of Glastonbury for the too evident purpose of the exaltation of their own monastery. How the church at Glastonbury was really founded, we shall have occasion to notice hereafter.

very learned examination of all the dates and circumstances of S. Paul's life, his missions, and several visits to Rome; his journey into Spain; the number of years he was "in journeyings often," and more particularly connecting him with the imprisonment of Caractacus, and his mention to Pudens and Claudia, concluded very safely that of all the various traditions as to the first preaching of the Gospel in Britain, that which attributes it to S. Paul is the most credible. The author of "British Chronicles" puts it summarily in these words:—

"Before his confinement, S. Paul, as we have seen, had expressed his intention of going into Spain, and the testimonies of the early fathers favour the supposition that he fulfilled this intention. To the interval between his first and second visit to Rome, Godeau, in his life of S. Paul, (lib. ii. 286,) allows eight years. Massutius rather more. Baronius the same, adding that it was 'time enough for him to travel through the whole world.' The question then is: Where did S. Paul spend all this time? It is not likely that a person of such ardent zeal should remain inactive during this period. The testimonies of Clement and others lead to the conclusion that his mission extended to the boundaries of the West. And supposing that he went back into the eastern parts to revisit the Churches he had planted, which it appears from the fathers that he did, still there would be sufficient time left for

him to preach the Gospel in Britain, and other western parts."*

Before we leave the Holy Scriptures we may mention another tradition connected with them, which seems to have some ground of belief, at any rate it is interesting to remark it. The tradition is, that the Aristobulus mentioned by S. Paul in Rom. xvi. 10 was ordained by the apostle as a bishop, and either accompanied him, or was sent by him to found a Church in Britain. His name is mentioned in the Greek Martyrology, cited by Archbishop Ussher; and it is said that, having made many converts, and formed them into Churches, with ecclesiastical rulers to preside over them, at length he suffered martyrdom.

So far then we have considered the various traditions concerning the first Christianity of the British people. To which indeed it may be replied, that such floating and vague accounts amount to very little; and that as far as the first century is concerned there is no certain opinion to be formed.

But first, we must remember the peculiar subject with which we have to deal, and the very remote ages to which we are alluding. It could not be well expected that, in such difficulties as surrounded the apostles in their first preaching, an accurate record should be kept of any one

* "Chronicles of the Ancient British Church," p. 19. See also Stillingfleet, p. 40.

particular nation. Consider the distance of Britain from the seat of the first faith, namely, the Holy Land; its distance also from the seat of government, namely, Rome; consider also the state of anarchy and confusion derived from the wars in which, as a savage nation, the Britons were continually engaged with the Romans; consider also that the Christian Faith was entirely a forbidden faith, and that the Romans were trying with all their power to exterminate it. All these things put together would readily account for the absence of any positive testimony as to the preaching of the Gospel among us. The wonder is, that we can say even as much as we do. And though we have no conclusive testimony as to the fact of S. Paul, or of Aristobulus, or of any other apostolic man, actually preaching the Gospel in Britain; yet that some among the British people were Christians towards the close of the first century, that the Church of Christ did exist among them, and that such a Church was therefore apostolical: of this we can have no doubt. The following testimonies from the Fathers of the Church will confirm what has been said:—

1. In the first century, Clement of Rome, A.D. 96, writes thus:—

"S. Paul preached in the East and West, leaving behind him an illustrious record of his faith, having taught the whole world righteousness,

and having travelled even *to the utmost bounds of the West.*"*

The expression "utmost bounds of the West," includes according to all rules of expression descriptive of ancient geography, Gaul, Spain, and *Britain.*

2. Irenæus, A.D. 178, disciple of S. Polycarp. He describes the Church as spread throughout the world, specially mentioning the Churches of Germany, Iberia, (Spain) and the *Celts*, by which term is included Gaul and Britain.

"There is no difference of faith or tradition in any of those countries; but as the sun, GOD'S creature, is one and the same in all the world, so also the preaching of the Truth shines everywhere, and lighteth every one who will come to the knowledge of the Truth."†

3. Tertullian, A.D. 193, speaks incidentally, in arguing against the Jews, of the faith of CHRIST in Britain.

"For in whom else have all the nations believed but in CHRIST? Parthians, Medes, Elamites, all the coasts of Spain, the various nations of Gaul, and the parts *inaccessible to the Romans, but now subject to* CHRIST."‡

The latter expression alludes to *Britain.*

4. Eusebius, the historian, A.D. 325, writing

---

* 1 Epist. ad Corinth. § 5. † Lib. i. c. 2, 3.
‡ Contr. Judæos, c. 7.

his account of the origin and spreading of the Gospel, having named the Romans, Persians, Armenians, Parthians, Indians, and Scythians, then adds that—

"Some passed over the ocean to those which are called the *British Isles*."*

5. S. Jerome, A.D. 390, says that—

"S. Paul having been in Spain, went from one ocean to another, imitating the course and motion of the sun, and that his diligence in preaching extended as far as the earth itself."†

In another place he adds—

"That he preached the Gospel in the western parts."

6. Theodoret, A.D. 493, speaks more strongly still of S. Paul having preached in Britain.

"The blessed apostle S. Paul teaches us in a few words to how many nations be carried the sacred doctrine of the Gospel; so that from Jerusalem round about Illyricum, he fully preached the Gospel of CHRIST. He went also afterwards to Italy and Spain, and carried salvation *to the islands which lie in the ocean*."‡

7. Venantius Fortunatus, A.D. 560, says:—

"S. Paul passed over the ocean to the Island of Britain, and to Thule, the extremity of the earth."§

8. Sophronius, patriarch of Jerusalem, A.D. 560, quoted by Godwin, expressly says:—

---

* Eccl. Hist., lib. iii. c. 4. † In Amos, c. 4.
‡ In 2 Timothy iv. 16. § Vita S. Martini, lib. iii.

"S. Paul visited our Island of Britain."

Lastly, our own British historian Gildas, who wrote in the middle of the sixth century, describes the commencement of the Church in Britain in these words :—

"Meanwhile, these islands, stiff with cold and frost, and in a distant region of the world, remote from the visible sun, received the beams of light, *i.e.* the holy precepts of CHRIST, (who is the true Sun, and who shews to the whole world His splendor, not only from the temporal firmament, but from the height of heaven, which surpasses anything temporal) at the latter part, as we know, of the reign of Tiberius Cæsar, by whom His religion was propagated without impediment, and death threatened to those who interfered with its professors."

The expression "meanwhile" alludes to an interval of about ten years, comprising the time of S. Paul's imprisonment at Rome, and that of Caractacus, as before mentioned, and is limited to the defeat of Boadicea, which occurred A.D. 61. It is just the very time when S. Paul and his British converts would be most likely to have visited Britain, and to have first introduced Christianity.

CHAPTER II.

WE conclude then that the Christian faith must have been made known in the British Islands so

early as the first century. But when we so conclude, we do not mean that it was *universally* made known. We do not mean that the whole of the people were brought into a well-organised and perfect system of Church government, such as we now see prevailing. Neither in Britain, nor in Gaul, nor even in Rome itself was this the case. Wherever indeed the Apostles did go forth and preach the Gospel of their LORD, they did so on the basis of a Church, with Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. This we know was the case in the foundation of those Churches of which we read in the Acts of the Apostles, Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, Rome itself. Therefore we conclude that Christianity being made known at all, it was so made known, as well in Britain as elsewhere, in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship: but then it could only have been so made known in isolated places, here and there, along the coast, among the Roman colonies, in places where might arise some connection between the subdued inhabitants and their conquerors. To imagine what the state of Britain was in the first and second centuries, we must picture to ourselves what the state of New Zealand must have been fifty years ago; nay, what it is even now. A vast territory of barbarous heathens. On some few favoured spots, here and there, a Christian Bishop, with his followers of Priests, Deacons, and Catechists, have made their descent, and begun to preach. Some converts have been

made; a Church is commenced; the heathens have come in, and are baptised. But even to this day, the Christians in comparison with the vast aggregate of the people, are not to be spoken of as embracing the whole country. The land is heathen still. So must it have been in our own heathen island in the first century. There was but a chance assembly here and there of Christians; a Church in some sense; but all must have been crude, vague, and unsettled.

Now this state of things will readily account for the great event which marks the second century, that of the conversion of Lucius, one of the kings of Britain.

The writers of the Roman party, such as Bede, Nennius, and Baronius, would bring all points to bear to show that the conversion of this Lucius was the first act of Christianity in the island; and that it was brought about solely by the mission of the Bishop of Rome. They say that Lucius, being a prince of great piety, and anxious to learn what Christianity was, but having no power to do so in his own country, or to receive holy baptism, sent over his ambassadors to Pope Eleutherius with a letter, requesting him to furnish the requisite means for establishing Christianity in the island; that Pope Eleutherius did so; that King Lucius was converted and baptised; and that thereupon ensued the conversion of the whole British people: consequently, they argue, the Church of the British is purely Roman. To

support this theory and this consequence, a letter is put forth as addressed by Pope Eleutherius in answer to an application made by the King in regard to the Roman Laws. The King's letter is not pretended to be extant, but the letter of the Pope is given us in these words :—

"You earnestly desire of us that we would send you the Roman Laws and Constitutions of the Emperor, that you might use the same in the kingdom of Britain. The Roman Laws and the Emperor we can always reprove, but the law of God is unblameable. You have lately received (through the infinite mercy of God) into your kingdom, not only the Law, but the Christian Faith also; you have at your command both Testaments; from them, therefore, by the assistance of God and your Council, extract laws, by which, under God, you may govern your kingdom. You are God's sole vicegerent in your own kingdom, according to that of the prophet: 'The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and all the inhabitants that dwell therein.' And again, Psalm xiv. 7: 'Thou lovest righteousness and hatest wickedness; therefore God, thy good God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows.' And again, in the same prophet: 'God is thy righteousness," not the righteousness and justice of Cæsar. All Christian people, especially those of your kingdom which live under your protection and peace, ought to be accounted and looked upon as your

own children, according to that of the Gospel: 'As the hen gathereth together her chickens under her wings.' The people of Britain are your people, which if at any time divided, you ought with your utmost care to reduce them to concord, and endeavour their peace and unity; furthermore to cherish, maintain, defend, and govern them, and, in fine, protect them from injurious and malicious persons, and take their part against their enemies. Woe to that kingdom that hath a child to their king, and whose princes eat in the morning. I do not call him a childish king in respect of minority, but in regard of his foolishness, wickedness, and madness, according to that of the kingly prophet: 'Bloody and deceitful men shall not live out half their days.' By eating, I mean greediness, by greediness luxury, by luxury, all filthy, evil, and unseemly things, according to that of King Solomon: Wisdom shall not descend into a wicked soul, neither shall it remain in a body subject to sin.' The name of Governor is not derived from his Government, but from well governing. You shall be a king so long as you rule well; which, unless you do, the name of king shall fail, and remain no longer in you; which God forbid. God grant you so to govern the kingdom of Britain, that you may at last reign with Him for ever, Whose vicar you are in the aforesaid kingdom."*

* Sammes's "Britannia Antiqua Illustrata," fol. 1676.

This letter of the Pope is esteemed of course by the Roman party to be very valuable; but by those learned men who have had the opportunity of examining carefully the grounds on which it rests, is pronounced nothing more or less than a forgery. In the first place, what necessity was there for King Lucius to send to Rome for a copy of the Imperial Law, when already there were within his reach Roman governors in the island, from whom he could have immediately procured it. In the second place, this letter is addressed as to one who was king of all Britain; whereas Lucius was a mere tributary prince of a small territory under the Roman power; for it was the policy of the Roman government, as we know from other instances, to suffer the kings of those nations whom they conquered to remain as their vassals, still ruling over their own people. In the next place the translations of Holy Scripture found in the letter are translations of S. Jerome, who did not exist till nearly two centuries ofter the pope who is said to have written the letter. And lastly, no one historian mentions the letter in any way until a thousand years after the death of Lucius. We cannot then do otherwise, by all the laws of evidence, than conclude that the whole letter is a fabrication.

Another authority is cited from Bede, one of our principal Saxon writers, flourishing in the eighth century. He takes no notice of the letter

of Pope Eleutherius, which so far confirms the assertion that it was a forgery; but being of the Roman party, he falls in with the Roman idea that Lucius owes his conversion to that Pope. He says:—

"In the year of our LORD's incarnation 156, Marcus Antonius Verus, the fourteenth from Augustus, was made Emperor, together with his brother Aurelius Commodus. In their time, whilst Eleutherius, a holy man, presided over the Roman Church, Lucius, King of the Britons, sent a letter to him, entreating that by his command he might be made a Christian. He soon obtained the object of his pious request; and the Britons preserved the faith which they had received, uncorrupted and entire, until the time of the Emperor Diocletian."*

Another authority is cited to the same effect, and from the same quarter, namely, the "Old Book of Llandaff."† It is there said that—

"King Lucius sent Eluanus (Elfan) and Medwinus (Medwy) to Eleutherius, twelfth Bishop of Rome, to desire that he might be made a Christian through his instruction; upon which he (Eleutherius) gave GOD thanks, that such a heathen nation should desire Christianity; and then by the advice of the Presbyters of the city of Rome, they first baptised those ambassadors;

---

* Bede's "Hist. Eccl.," lib. i. c. iv. Dr. Giles's Translation.

† Monast. Angl., vol. iii. p. 188.

and being well instructed, they ordained them, making Eluanus a bishop, and Medwinus a teacher; and so they returned to King Lucius, who, with the chief of the Britons, was baptised; and then, according to the instructions of Eleutherius, he settled the ecclesiastical order, caused bishops to be ordained, and the Christian religion to be taught."

Upon which Bishop Stillingfleet justly remarks:—

"But there is one difficulty yet to be cleared; for all this story, in its best circumstances, seems to imply that there was no Christian Church here before. For if there had been, what need to have sent as far as Rome to be instructed, unless the *Bishop of Rome were then known to be the head of the Church*, which were a sufficient reason for it.

"To this I answer, that if the contest lay between these two things, whether it be more credible that Christianity was planted here before King Lucius, or that King Lucius was baptised by order of Eleutherius, I should very much prefer the former; because the authority of Gildas, as to British Christianity, is to be relied on before the later writers; and Gildas asserts the one: and although he had as much reason as Bede, or any after him, he never takes the least notice of King Lucius and Eleutherius." *

---

* "Origines Britannicæ," q. 68.

It is very clear why this version of the story of King Lucius is thus put forth. It is shortly and significantly stated in the passage just quoted, namely, to shew that "*the Bishop of Rome was then the head of the Church.*" Such is the key of all these assertions in the early Roman writers. It is to this purpose that all is done, written, and even fabricated with the most unscrupulous use of every means at hand. Sad indeed it is to think how a suspicion is thrown on all our early history by this unjustifiable perversion of it.

What, however, are we to conclude as to the story of King Lucius? Upon the whole there seems to be no doubt but that there was such a British King as Lucius, or, as it is written in Welsh, Lleirwg, signifying "The great light;" and that he embraced Christianity, and that he was the first royal personage who transferred the authority of the former religion of the Bards or Druids to the Christian faith. Of all this there can be no doubt whatever. The tradition seems to be, that Lucius upon ascending the throne of his Silurian or Welsh Kingdom, comprehending that portion of Wales which is now called Glamorganshire, with some of the adjoining counties, either then or previously had embraced Christianity; that being in doubt as to the best way of protecting and establishing his new faith among his people, he did send an embassy to Pope Eleutherius, who was the 12th Bishop in succession from S. Peter. Considering the diffi-

culties of his position as under the Roman governors in things political, and desirous of establishing his own faith to the exclusion of the ancient one, which was that of the Druids; it was natural that he should apply to the seat of the most noted Bishopric within reach. His application, however, was not for the introduction of Christianity, nor for his own baptism; but for advice in the direction and management of the Church. Four persons of note were concerned in this embassy; Dyfan, Ffagan, Medwy, and Elfan, native Christians, and some of them of the same kindred as the king, descended from Caractacus. Two of them were afterwards bishops in the British Church. It appears that the real reason of Lucius sending this embassy to Rome was his perplexity as to the manner of disengaging himself from the laws of the Druids, whose religion he had forsaken. The worship of the Druids consisted in offering sacrifice and prayer within circles of unwrought stones, exposed to the open air; and they had certain constitutional privileges and immunities attached to their office as priests of religion. They had certain lands attached to them for their maintenance; they were exempt from personal attendance in war; they had a right to support and maintenance when passing from one place to another, and exemption from taxes. Now the object of the king was to pass these privileges over from the Druidical Priesthood to the

Christian; but how to effect it was his anxiety. A legal sanction was desired for the transition, but it could only be obtained by the consent of each tribe in whose territories the former priesthood existed.

At first these Druidical circles were changed, as they stood, into places of Christian worship; the very same places serving to the new religion as to the old; and it is said that some of these circles remain even to this day. In one, Carn Groes, on the mountain of Gelly-Onen, there still remains a very ancient cross which shews that it had been so transferred.* But then, just as in Solomon's time, so in that of King Lucius, he desired to build God an house, to constitute and establish the new Priesthood, and to endow it with land and with privileges of religion. This, by degrees, he effected, and so one of the Triads especially says, speaking of the endowment of Bishoprics in England:—

"The first was Llandaf, the gift of Lleirwg, the son of Coel, the son of Cyllin, who first gave lands and privileges to such as first embraced the Faith of Christ."†

Llandaf seems thus to have been the first established Bishop's See in Great Britain, and the first place in which the building of a church arose as opposed to the former Druidical circles.

---

* "Eccles. Antiq. of Cymry," p. 71.

† Triad 62. "Ecclesiastical Antiquities of Cymry."

Four churches seem afterwards to have arisen in the reign of King Lucius, bearing the respective names of Lleirwg, Dyvan, Fagan, and Medwy. Dyvan is considered to be the first Bishop of Llandaf, and to have suffered martyrdom on the spot which is now occupied by the church dedicated to his memory. He was succeeded by Fagan, one of whose favourite aphorisms has been handed down by the Welsh Bards:—

"Didst thou hear the saying of Fagan
When he had pronounced his argument?
'*Where God is silent it is not wise to speak.*'"

But King Lucius, not content with the church of Llandaf, proceeded to found many others. The tradition concerning these appears indeed to be very vague, and upon the whole can only be received as a tradition. Nevertheless, as such it is still to be recorded.

First, then, it is said that Lucius converted not only the Druidical worship into the Christian, but also many Pagan temples into Christian churches:—

1. A Temple dedicated to Diana in London, now S. Paul's Cathedral.

2. A Temple dedicated to Apollo, now the Abbey of S. Peter's, Westminster.

3. He made over many lands to the University of Cambridge, and this is mentioned in two Royal Charters of great antiquity, one of King

Arthur, A.D. 531, and the other of Cadwallader, A.D. 685. But concerning these charters, most learned men are now agreed that nothing certain can be said.

4. He built S. Paul's Church in Cornhill, London, in which he was joined by Ciran, one of his principal courtiers and officers of state. This became the seat of the Bishopric of London, and the name of Thean is given us as the first Bishop of London thus established.

5. The Church of Gloucester.

6. The Church at Winchester.

7. A Church and College at Bangor.

8. The Church of S. Mary at Glastonbury.

9. A Chapel in Dover Castle.

10. The Church of Canterbury, which was afterwards dedicated to S. Martin.

But of all these, says Fuller, in his quaint style:—

"Of all these, that at Winchester was King Lucius his darling, which he endowed with large revenues, giving it all the land twelve miles on every side of the city; fencing the church with a churchyard, on which he bestowed privileges of a sanctuary, and building a dormitory and refectory for the monks there; if the little history of Winchester* is to be believed, whose credit is very suspicious, because of the modern language

* MS. in Bibliotheca Cottoniana.

used therein; for as country painters, when they are to draw some of the ancient Scripture patriarchs, used to make them with bands, cuffs, hats, and caps, in *à la mode* to the times wherein they themselves do live; so it seemeth the author of that history last cited (lacking learning to acquaint him with the zeal and character of the age of King Lucius) doth pourtray and describe the bounty and church-buildings of the King according to the phrase and fashion of that mode of working in his own age."*

But not only were the labours and zeal of Lucius confined to Britain; but some authors† pursue his history by telling us that, resigning his kingdom and abandoning a secular life, he travelled into Gaul and Germany, and after converting many souls became Bishop of Chur in the territories of Zurick, and there ultimately suffered martyrdom in the reign of the Emperor Marcus Aurelius. Other traditions, however, assert that the Lucius who suffered martyrdom was a different person from the British King, and that King Lucius died in peace in his native country, and was buried in the great church of Gloucester in the year of our Lord 201.‡

Thus much for the life and history of Lucius. The very fact of so much controversy issuing on

* Fuller's "Church History," book i. p. 39.

† Polydore Vergil.

‡ Matthew Paris and Matthew of Westminster, quoted in Collier's "Eccles. Hist."

the subject of his conversion manifests the importance in which it was held. Its importance turns upon the fact of its dependence, either upon Rome, or upon those native sources of the faith which were existing prior to communication with Pope Eleutherius. We gather at least this much from the conflicting accounts which are placed before us; namely, that from some source or other, the Christian Faith had made considerable progress in Britain in the second century. The bishoprics of two great cities founded by name, Llandaf and London; and the Bishops of the Sees handed down to us historically, by name; the building of churches, and of monastic or collegiate institutions; all these as facts, whether they be precisely in the order in which we read them or not, still having any foundation at all, prepare us to contend that the ancient British people did in some way possess and retain the Faith of Christ in the second century. Subsequent to Lucius we have other names eminent in the same progress of the faith, connecting Lucius with the Diocletian era, of which we shall next have to speak. These were Gwerydd, Jestin, and Cadvrawd, in direct descent from Caradog, or Caractacus; others also whose names are mentioned in the Welsh genealogies, one of whom, Cadvrawd, is said to have been a Bishop. There is also a church dedicated to Gwerydd in Gwent, of which he is considered the founder.

But this is sufficient for our present purpose. Bearing in mind the peculiar nature of the time to which we are referring, here is ample proof of the great main features of our position. The apostolic line of Bishops as originally founded in the first century was not lost in the second; on the contrary, the tree was taking root downwards and bearing fruit upwards. Not only was the faith preached, and barely made known as in a strange and inhospitable shore, but kings and chief men were now its public professors. A church was founded, established, and endowed. The sees and churches of Bishops were known things. It is not pretended that they were general, or pervaded the whole people, but at least they were on a recognised footing, and in some way a part of the constitution of the land.

CHAPTER III.

The third century passed over the shores of Britain without much additional light reflecting on the truths of Christ's holy Church. Even tradition is silent nearly a hundred years; and from the death of Lucius, in the reign of Severus, A. D. 201, until late in the reign of Diocletian, A. D. 303, there is hardly an event or even a legend worth mentioning. This only we know, that the Romans, pursuing their usual victorious career, and gradually subduing the whole island, parcelled it

out into provinces under the military government of their successful generals; and thus by the intermixture of themselves with the ancient inhabitants of the land, imparted to them the arts of civilized life. The Roman soldier would look upon the profession of Christianity as of no further importance than the way in which it might affect the extent and security of his power; and therefore as long as obedience to his arms was successfully exacted, the religion of the cross would meet with contemptuous indifference. And thus gradually and unperceived the Christians would increase in numbers and influence until some indiscreet act in reference to the worship of Paganism, or the authority of military discipline, would draw upon them the anger of the Roman power. This had in fact occurred more than once, and the sufferings of the faithful had been great. Nine general persecutions of the Christians are recorded from the time of Nero downwards; and now, in the commencement of the fourth century, the tenth and most severe of all impended over them.

The Emperor Diocletian, raised from the humblest origin to the imperial purple, ascended the throne in the year 284, and for some time manifested a peaceable and tolerant disposition; but at length it was the will of God that by means of this great tyrant should arise the fiercest trial of the faith that the world ever saw. His edicts against the Christians throughout the whole em-

pire first began in the year 303. It was in Nicomedia, the principal seat of the imperial government, that the persecution first commenced. The destruction of the churches, the burning of copies of the Scriptures, the removal of every Christian who held any public office, was the subject of the first edict. Then followed others of a more sanguinary kind, by which the Christians were compelled either to sacrifice to pagan gods in apostacy, or to suffer death. Eusebius, the principal historian of these times, describes it thus :—

"Vast numbers of the bishops endured with a noble resolution the most appalling trials; and exhibited instances of illustrious conflicts for the faith. Others, however, broken and reduced in spirit by timidity before the contest began, yielded at the first onset. They all encountered various kinds of torments. Here was one that was scourged with rods; there another tormented with the rack, and excruciating scrapings; in which some at the time endured the most terrible deaths. Here one, whilst some forced him to the impure and detestable sacrifice, was dismissed as if he had sacrificed, although he had not; there another, although he had not in the least approached the altar, nor even touched the unholy thing, yet when others said he had sacrificed, went away in silence. Here one taken up half dead was thrown away as already dead; there another, lying upon the ground, was dragged

away by the feet, and numbered among those that had sacrificed. One would cry out, and with a loud voice declare his abhorrence of the sacrifice; another would exclaim that he was a Christian, furnishing by his confession an illustrious example of the Salutary Name: but these were forced to silence by numerous bands of soldiers, prepared for this purpose, by whom they were struck on the face and cheek, and violently driven away."*

Gildas, our own historian, describes it even in stronger language:—

"The churches were demolished throughout the whole empire; the Holy Scriptures searched for and burnt in the streets; and the priests and people dragged to the shambles and butchered like sheep: insomuch that in some provinces there were scarcely any remains of Christianity left. How miserably the Christians were forced to fly from one country to another! What slaughters! What various kinds of torment! What numbers were affrighted into apostacy; and how gloriously others endured the trial, and went content to their martyrdom! In short, how savage the heathens were in their persecution, and how remarkable the Christians for their patience, may be learned from ecclesiastical history; during which time, the whole Church seemed to be under execution, and charging

* Eusebius, "Hist. Eccles." lib. viii.

bravely through this ill-affected, inhospitable world, marched as it were in whole bodies to heaven."*

It is good for us in these days of religious indolence and luxurious apathy, to be recalled to the times when Christianity was not merely a figurative, but a real following of our Blessed Lord. We do not understand the call of the Cross now-a-days, for we never feel it. It would perhaps be a blessing, and certainly a great purifier of the corruptions that surround us, if some of us could be cast back into the times of Diocletian. We might testify to the faith somewhat more clearly than we do. Seventeen thousand martyrs suffered death within a month; and in addition to these, hundreds upon hundreds dragged out a painful life in banishment, and in the public works, whither they were condemned. Verily, "they bore about in their bodies the dying of the Lord Jesus."

What the historians thus describe as the persecution of the general Roman Empire, they also apply to our own country in particular. England has never been backward in furnishing her portion of the witnesses of the cross,—nay, perhaps more than her portion, for she is especially called "the land of saints." In the Diocletian persecution, at any rate, she bore her part right nobly.

---

* Hist. p. 11.

Amphibalus was a priest of the British Church. He seems to have been one pre-eminent among the people for some great power of preaching or of sanctity. He was compelled to fly from place to place to escape the persecution then raging throughout the British Islands; and in the course of this he took refuge at Verulam, a Roman colony. Here he was detected by Alban, a native Briton, but, according to the custom, serving in the Roman army. Alban was a pagan, and knew not CHRIST. His duty, as a Roman soldier, was to expose, if not to slay, the Christian priest, whom he had thus accidentally detected; but though a pagan, he was, like the good centurion in the Apostolic times, a man of a noble and generous spirit. The lamentable and exhausted state of the poor Christian priest excited his compassion, and the grace of the Holy Spirit moved him to sympathy. Instead of exposing the priest to the fury of the rabble or the soldiery, he gave him shelter, took him to his own home, and defended him. It was not likely that a good work so begun should have no further ending. Alban listened to the priest, heard what Christianity was, prayed, and was converted. Presently, the other soldiers came up, searching for Amphibalus, whom they heard to be there. He was traced to his retreat, detected, and the next day was to be brought out for execution. When the soldiers came to the house, Alban hastily clothed Amphibalus in his own military garments; while on

his own part, he assumed the caracalla, or hair cassock, of the priest. Thus arrayed, he was carried before the governor. His disguise, however, did not avail him long; and the Judge, standing by the pagan altar, immediately required the detected soldier either to make the sacrifice or to die. "I am a Christian," said the undaunted Alban. "I cannot obey." The governor asked him of his family, and his origin. "To what purpose do you require my family, or my origin?" said Alban. "If you desire to hear the truth of my religion, be it known to you that I am a Christian, and bound by Christian duties." "I ask your name," said the judge, "tell me it immediately." "I am called Alban by my parents," he replied, "and I worship and adore the true and living God, who created all things." Then the judge, inflamed with anger, said: "If you will enjoy the happiness of eternal life, you will not delay to offer sacrifice to the gods." To which Alban rejoined: "These sacrifices, which by you are offered to devils, neither can avail the subjects, nor answer the wishes or desires of those that offer up their supplications to them. On the contrary, whosoever shall offer sacrifice to these images shall receive the everlasting pains of hell." Upon this, he was put through the usual tortures of the confession; scourged and racked; then finally, the judge perceiving that nothing would shake his faith, he was put to death. The place where he suf-

fered was a hill clothed with flowers and verdure, sloping gradually down to the plain beneath. It was called Holmshurst in the Saxon, signifying a woody place. It may now be seen near the city of S. Alban, whose name still chronicles the martyr's death. Close by the seat of martyrdom was built afterwards a church, and now, even as it stands at this present day, we behold its successor, the noble cathedral or abbey of S. Alban's.

"Thus was Alban tried,
England's first martyr, whom no threats could shake,
Self-offered victim; for his friend he died,
And for the faith; nor shall his name forsake
That hill, whose flowery platform seems to rise
By nature decked for holiest sacrifice."*

But this was not all. Alban indeed was the protomartyr, but he only led the way for many followers in the same confession. Amphibalus himself did not long escape, but suffered martyrdom, with nine others, in the town of Redburn, three miles from Verulam. Giraldus, an historian of the twelfth century, relates that—

"After S. Alban, the protomartyr, and next to him Amphibalus, Julius and Aaron were esteemed the chief martyrs of Britannia major, and that they were buried at Caerleon, upon Usk, the seat of a bishopric, founded in the preceding century;" and he says, that "in ancient time there were three fine churches in that city, one dedicated to Julius the martyr, graced with a choir of nuns;

* Wordsworth.

another to Aaron his associate, and ennobled with an order of canons; and the third distinguished as the metropolitan see of Wales."*

After ten years of persecution, such as we have here described, and of which S. Alban is a type, peace was at length restored, and the Church came forth victorious from her trial, in the reign of Constantius Chlorus. His son, Constantine, then ruling in Britain, succeeded his father in the year of our Lord 313, and he becoming himself a Christian, the ages of heathen persecution for ever ceased.

But although there was cessation from shedding the blood of martyrs, there was no cessation, alas! from the intestine commotions of heresy. All along the Church's course, even from S. John downwards, heresy with its bitter poison has never ceased to molest, to embitter, and to weaken the Catholic Faith. The persecutions of the first three centuries had kept it down, or had merged it in necessary silence while men were struggling for their lives, or seeking with contentment the bare toleration of their creed: but now that the blood of martyrs ceased to flow, and Satan could no longer hope to destroy the Church by outward enemies, he turned the bitterness of his attack to the inward souls of men, perverting, dividing, and rending the flock asunder from within. It is true, as Gildas and

* Girald. Cambr. Item. lib. i. c. 5.

Bede tell us, that now the faithful Christians, who during the time of danger had hidden themselves in the woods and deserts, appeared again in public and rebuilt their desolated churches, dedicating them in the names of the martyrs whom they had lost; but it is also true that from this very time, when first the wearer of the Imperial purple professed the Faith of the Cross, those many dissensions arose more openly, issuing in Councils of the Church, which by the fact of the Emperor becoming a Christian, he was enabled more readily to call together.

And here too as before in the martyrdoms, so again in the Great Councils of the Catholic Church; the British Christians took their share. In the year 314, the very first year of external peace, we find the Council of Arles; afterwards in 325, the Great General Council of Nice; afterwards, 347, Sardica; afterwards, 360, Ariminum; and lastly, 363, Antioch. Now in all these councils, we know that the British bishops, as prelates of a National Church, were recognised and admitted by all to be a portion of the great Catholic body, took their seats in her government, participated in the discussion which arose concerning the faith, and subscribed the Canons of discipline: and indeed when we consider that the first Emperor of Rome who embraced the faith had spent the choicest years of his life in Britain, being born there himself of a British lady, Helena, the wife of Constantius; when we

know that Constantius, his father, died in the City of York, and that when Constantine was called to ascend the throne, he was at that very time occupied with his Government in Britain: when we know all these facts of history as simple facts, it is surely most accordant with probability that Constantine, in calling together his councils, should have remembered and placed in the very first rank those bishops of the Church whom he had occasion personally to remember in Britain.

Such was the case. The Council of Arles was called to consider the question of the Donatist schism in Africa. There we find the names of three British bishops representing the British Church, together with a priest and deacon attending upon them:—

1. Eborius, Bishop of York.
2. Restitutus, Bishop of London.
3. Adelfius, Bishop (most probably) of Caerleon upon Usk. *
4. Sacerdos, a Priest.

---

* The actual signature in the Records of the Council stands thus:—"Adelfius Episcopus de civitate Coloniæ Londinensium," but this is supposed to be an error of the copyist; for as Britain was at that time divided into three provinces, there was most likely a bishop selected from each province or colonia. It has been supposed by some to mean *Colchester*, by others *Lincoln*, by others *Caerleon on Usk*. But the question is one more for antiquaries than for us. We only care to know that the Church of Britain was a recognised Church, taking her apportionate place among the prelates of the Church throughout the world.

5. Arminius, a Deacon.

Further on, *i.e.* about eleven years subsequent to the Council of Arles, the great Council of Nice took place; that Council to which we ever refer the place of honour as the first and chief defence of the Catholic faith throughout the world. It was held principally against the heresy of Arius, who denied the eternity of the Son of God. We do not indeed find any names of British bishops as present, but we have good reason to infer that some were actually there; because in the letter of Constantine summoning the bishops, he directed them to come out of "*all provinces of the empire.*"

"We may reasonably presume," says Bishop Lloyd, "that the British Church consented to the canons of this Council; nay, we have more than presumption for it, from the Emperor himself; who declaring that the Council's rule concerning Easter was received in the provinces, saith expressly that it was received in Britain." *

There is a difficulty however as to this assertion, that *all* the British bishops received the canons of Nice; for we shall find, as hereafter to be related, that the bishops, or at least some of them, still adhered in the time of S. Augustine to the ancient customs of Easter, which we know were opposed to Nice. We may perhaps account for this by supposing that such of the bishops

* Hist. "Account of Church Government," ch. iii. v. 4.

as had been more under the influence of the Roman Emperor, as that of York must have been, would readily fall in with the Emperor; while those of Wales (the Cymry) would be more apt, not having been under his influence, to retain their ancient usages. But be this as it may, there is in all this a most convincing proof, either way, of the flourishing state of the British Church at this time; and of its entire independence, either in jurisdiction, or influence, of the See of Rome.

Now, still again, at the Council of Sardica, A.D. 347, the British bishops joined in the condemnation of Arius; and for this we have the testimony of Athanasius himself.* At any rate, we find a certain testimony to the orthodox faith of the British Church at this time from S. Hilary, Bishop of Poictiers; for he, writing from Phrygia, takes in "the *Provinces* of *Britain*," and says: "I congratulate you upon having continued undefiled in the LORD, and untainted by the contagion of heresy."

Then, once more, the Council of Ariminum, or Rimini, in Italy, was convened in the year 360. Here again we have testimony of the British Church. Sulpicius Severus relates that more than four hundred bishops of the West attended this Council; unto all of whom he says that

* See Ussher's "Britann. Eccles. Antiq." p. 105. Athan. "Apol. contr. Arianos."

the Emperor had ordered apartments to be given, and their charges to be paid; but that it was deemed unbecoming to receive it on the part of the Aquitans, Gauls, and Britons, who preferred to take the expenses of their journey on themselves; and then he adds,

"Three only from Britain, on account of poverty, made use of the public gift, after they had rejected the contributions offered by the others, considering it more proper to burden the exchequer than individuals."*

And as we are thus confident of the orthodoxy and flourishing state of the British Church at the Council of Ariminum, so we have testimony again of the same truth at Antioch. The Council of Antioch was convened A.D. 363, and there Athanasius himself again bears testimony with the bishops there assembled. They assure the Emperor Jovian that the Bishops of Spain, Gaul, and Britain, continued to adhere to the Nicene faith, of which they had been informed by letters from those bishops themselves.

But here it may be said, To what end have all these things been urged, and to what purpose do they serve? Simply and fundamentally this:—they are the proof from century to century of an independent Catholic Church and an Apostolic Hierarchy existing in the Islands of Britain,

* Sulpicius Severus, lib. ii. c. iv.

from the very beginning. We have no account of any subjection of the ancient British Church to the See of Rome; or that she was in any special manner bound to her as her founder or originator. We have no account of any claim on the part of Rome to interfere with her discipline, or direct her doctrine. On the contrary the Church of Britain, just as the other Churches of the different provinces of the Roman Empire, is involved in the persecutions of the Pagan Emperors, suffers with them, sheds the blood of her martyrs with them, and bears testimony to the common faith by the common ties of her relationship to the Apostles and Jesus Christ, from whom she descends.

And when the persecutions are over, she takes her part in the deliberations of the Catholic Councils against the heresies of the age, just as the other Churches in Spain, Gaul, Italy, and Rome itself. Her bishops join with the other bishops; her bishops write letters to and receive letters from the other bishops. Her soundness in the orthodox Creed is testified and acknowledged universally; and she takes her part, albeit as a nation hardly emerging from barbarism, in all that is said and done by the Church throughout the world. And all this, when as yet claims of Rome to any jurisdiction as distinctly and separately above the other Churches had not been heard of.

CHAPTER IV.

While the Roman Empire had been gradually introducing the arts of civilized life, and the Church had been growing up so securely, that the greater part of the British nation was now within the pale of Christianity; there was arising in the North a cloud which was ultimately destined to burst upon the land with overwhelming ruin. The flower of the British youth had been drafted by the laws of military discipline into the Roman legions, and had either perished in the interminable wars which the Empire was forced to maintain in distant countries, or, becoming alienated from the customs and the affections of their native land, were unwilling to return. The consequence was that for any purpose of defence against the more immediate enemies of their own country, the British people were helpless. The rebellion of Maximus, about the year 383, against the Emperor Theodosius, had more especially drawn away their ablest chiefs, and had at the same time dissevered the former bonds of sympathy which had existed between Rome and Britain.

And now it was that, while the great hordes of barbarians from the North and from the East, and principally the Goths under Alaric, were ravaging the whole of Italy, and laying siege even to the gates of the imperial city, the

British people, following the example of other distant provinces, threw off their allegiance to Rome, and for a period of forty years became an independent nation. Honorius himself, then Emperor of the West, seemed tacitly to acquiesce, and withdrawing his legions from Britain, informed his former subjects that they must now learn to depend upon themselves. But of this imprudent claim on the one hand, and the unwilling permission on the other, the Britons soon learned the bitter penalty; for although in appearance their own native chiefs resumed their authority, and the municipal towns left to them by the Romans exercised a kind of jurisdiction within their own sphere, still all real power and all permanent strength had, with the Roman legions, departed.

There had long dwelt on the confines of Northumberland, in the regions of Caledonia, a most bitter enemy of the ancient Britons. These were the Picts, so called most probably from the savage custom of painting their naked bodies for battle; and to these native inhabitants of Caledonia had been joined certain warlike tribes who had come over from the adjacent borders of Ireland, under the name of Scots. These two powerful and hostile clans had never been subdued by the arms of Rome. They had all along maintained their barbarism and their independence; and although from time to time they had suffered at the hands of the Romans, in their

various incursions, and had been kept at bay by walls of defence built at several times by Adrian, Antoninus, and Severus, still they ever continued a source of terror to the more civilized Britons dwelling on their borders. It was natural therefore that the hostility of these warlike tribes should be alive to the increased opportunity now within their reach, and that they should soon be found in open war with their ancient enemies. Twice had the Roman legions been sent to the defence of the enfeebled Britons; but now, having finally departed, there was no longer any reliance for the British chiefs but upon themselves. This reliance however was useless. The Picts and Scots, united in a savage barbarism, conquered and laid waste the land wheresoever their predatory habits and their warlike nature led them; and the whole of Britain, suffering under their hands, and at the same time enfeebled by the gross vices of her native princes and nobility, the growing inefficiency of her clergy, and above all by her own effeminacy, was about to be delivered up to their power. The most ancient historians upon whom reliance can be placed are Gildas and Bede, who represent in lamentable colours the gross degeneracy of the Britons. The British kings are described as stained with every vice, ruling not for the protection, but for the spoil of their subjects; and their misconduct involving both kings and people in one common ruin. Once more they appeal to the Romans,

and once more and for ever they are rejected. We who at the present day make such boast of the courage and bravery of our people, and speak in figure of the "*British Lion*," may well be astonished when we read such a petition as the following, which the Britons in their extremity put forth:—

"To Æteius, thrice consul, the groans of the Britons.

"The barbarians drive us back to the sea; the sea again putteth us back to the barbarians. Thus between two kinds of death, we are either slaughtered or drowned. We are the remnants that survive of the Britons, and are your subjects, who, besides the enemy, are afflicted by famine and mortality, which at this present time extremely rageth in the land."

But all this supplication, low and degrading as it appears, was still in vain. The Romans had no longer power to furnish the required assistance.

In an evil hour, Vortigern, who was at that time the most powerful of the British kings, determined to seek aid of the Saxons. But as Vortigern was the most powerful, so he was the most licentious and wicked of princes; and hence it was, no doubt, that the many dreadful evils arose which soon devastated the whole land. Not only war, but plague and pestilence swept away the people by thousands, insomuch that, Gildas reports, the living were scarce enough to

bury the dead. "And when God called to weeping and mourning, and to baldness and girding with sackcloth, behold joy and gladness, slaying of oxen, and killing of sheep, eating flesh and drinking wine." Fearful indeed is the picture of this licentious and wicked people; and just the judgment, which too plainly was the result of their many wickednesses. The Church of Jesus Christ had freely been given them. For well-nigh three hundred years they had enjoyed the Light of Christ's Gospel; but still the same depth of sin remained, as though they had never seen it. They had known many holy men who had taught and lived among them, but still the same recklessness to all but sensual and effeminate indulgences; and so it no doubt was that the measure of their iniquities was full, and God gave them over to the heathens, so that the light that was in them became darkness.

Hengist and Horsa were powerful chieftains of Saxony. They had been noted as piratical warriors ready for any deed of enterprise or daring. To them Vortigern in his extremity applied. It was the profession as well as the interest of these Saxons to lend a ready ear to such an application. They landed on the shores of Kent, and soon defeated the enemy against whom they were dispatched by Vortigern; but observing the richness of the country, and the feebleness of its inhabitants, they very soon changed their character of allies or defenders, into that of

robbers and spoilers. Tribe after tribe from Saxony, Jutland, and various parts of Germany, needy and savage men, ready for any deed of violence, poured in upon the rich plains of Britain, and while they faithfully performed their duty in arresting devastations of the northern foe, they too readily succeeded to their place in appropriating the British possessions to their own use, and becoming eventually the masters of the whole land. The miserable remains of life yet remaining among the British princes was soon driven northward, towards Caledonia; or westward, either into the mountains of Wales or barren rocks of Cornwall. So complete was the subjugation of the country under these invading hordes, that the very name of Britain was from henceforth lost to the greater part of the southern and eastern coasts, and from the Angli, the principal tribe of the invaders, the name of Angle-land, or England took its rise.

Thus, from the Roman power, which at least with its dominion brought civilization in the time of Lucius and Constantine, the British nation in a moment of imbecile folly, or sinful cowardice, retreated with all its previous blessings, and passed itself over into the hands of mere savage pagan hordes. The Church also, with its constituted priesthood and endowed bishopricks, fell beneath the same ruthless destruction, and from the year 450, which was the commencement of the Saxon irruption, to the year 596, when from a foreign

and unexpected quarter light at last beamed on the benighted Saxons, the Church of CHRIST was unknown save in the fastnesses of Wales and Cornwall, or the remote and barren moors of Scotland. It was in the year 586 that Theonus and Thadiocus, Archbishops of London and York, fled from their sees and sought safety in Wales. The Churches were demolished, and the worship of CHRIST abandoned. London once more sacrificed to Diana, while the horrid rites of Woden and of Friga succeeded to the preaching of the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST.

But this great crisis in the early history of our nation had not arrived without a very remarkable falling away in doctrine, as well as in the discipline and sanctity of the Church. For at the close of the fourth century, and running all along the fifth, up to the period of the Saxon irruption, there had grown up and still existed a most pestilential heresy. Pelagius,* a monk of Bangor, who appears to have been a very learned and able man, travelled into Africa, Palestine, and Italy. During his residence in Rome, he propounded and taught that original sin did not exist in the human nature, that man could be righteous and acceptable to GOD of his own merits, and needed not the sanctification of the Holy Spirit. Adam, he said, would have died, though

* The word Pelagius is Greek, meaning the same as Morgan in Welsh, signifying the "*sea-born.*"

he had not sinned; and infants at their birth contracted no contagion from Adam's fall. There was no necessity, therefore, for a second or new birth, and consequently no necessity for baptism; that man could of his own free will and power attain any degree of moral perfection and holiness.*

Now, although, in common with the whole Catholic Church, we cannot but lament the grievous mischief of such a heresy as this; still, considering the fact that no fewer than thirty councils were held concerning it; that a council of more than two hundred bishops met at Carthage to refute it; that it was condemned by the General Council of Ephesus in the year 418; considering also that it provoked the writings of some of the most eminent fathers of the Church, particularly S. Augustine; we have, at least, a melancholy satisfaction in dwelling on it as a point of history. For, arising as it did from the shores of Britain, it affords sufficient proof of a very great state of advancement in the ancient British Church. No heresy, such as that of Pelagius, could have been propounded, advanced, and become the cause of such learned discussions throughout the Catholic world, except it had been from a source well recognised and known. It is indeed a blot in the annals of our ancient Church—but it is a blot which, whatever else it

* S. Augustine, "De Hæresibus."

does, clearly sets forth that the ancient Church of our country held no unimportant place in history.

More, too, depended upon it than merely this: for the clergy of Britain, perceiving how fatally the poison of this heresy was beginning to work, sent over to the Church of Gaul for counsel and assistance; and that Church immediately despatched two of their eminent bishops, S. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre; and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes. These holy men arriving in Britain held a conference with the Pelagian party at Verulam (S. Alban's.) Fastidius was at that time Bishop of London, and Metropolitan of the British Churches. Some say that he was himself tainted with the Pelagian heresy; but be that as it may, the conference was held; and under the faithful preaching of the Gallican bishops, the heresy was for a time set aside. Bede, who is our authority for this, describes the preaching of S. Germanus and Lupus in the following language:—

"In the meantime the apostolical priests filled the Island of Britain with the fame of their preaching and virtues; and the Word of God was by them daily administered, not only in the churches, but even in the streets and fields; so that the Catholics were everywhere confirmed, and those who had gone astray, corrected. Like the Apostles, they had honour and authority through a good conscience; obedience to their

doctrine, through their sound learning; whilst the reward of virtue attended upon their numerous merits. Thus the generality of the people readily embraced their opinions. The authors of the erroneous opinions kept themselves in the back-ground; and like spirits grieved for the loss of the people that were rescued from them. At length, after mature deliberation, they had the boldness to enter the lists, and appeared for public disputation; conspicuous for riches, glittering in apparel, and supported by the flatteries of many; choosing rather to hazard the combat than to undergo the dishonour among the people of having been silenced; lest they should seem, by saying nothing, to condemn themselves.

"An immense multitude were there assembled, with their wives and children. The people stood around as spectators and judges; but the parties present differed very much in appearance. On the one side was divine faith, on the other human presumption: on the one side piety, on the other pride: on the one side Pelagius, on the other Christ. The holy priests, Germanus and Lupus, permitted their adversaries to speak first; who long took up the time and filled the ears with empty words. Then the venerable prelates poured forth the torrent of their apostolical and evangelical eloquence. Their discourse was interspersed with scriptural sentences; and they supported their most weighty assertions by read-

ing the written testimony of famous writers. Vanity was convinced, and perfidiousness confuted; so that at every objection made gainst them, not being able to reply, the Pelagians confessed their errors. The people, who were judges, could scarcely refrain from violence; but signified their judgment by their acclamations."*

But so deeply imbedded in the hearts of the people was this great heresy, and so indefatigable the arts by which it was propagated, that no sooner had these holy bishops departed, than it broke out afresh. Again, therefore, the Church had recourse to her former defenders:—

"The holy Germanus was entreated by all the priests that he would again defend the cause of God, which he had before asserted. He speedily complied with their request; and taking with him Severus, a man of singular sanctity, who was a disciple of the most holy father Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, and who, as Bishop of Treves, preached the word of God in the adjacent parts of Germany, put to sea, and was calmly wafted over into Britain. . . . . The priests arrived, and were met by the ignorant multitude, whom they blessed, and preached the word of God to them. . . . . By the judgment of all, the spreaders of the heresy, who had been expelled the island, were brought before the priests, to be

* Bede, "Historia Ecclesiastica," lib. i. cap. xvii.

conveyed up into the continent, that the country might be rid of them, and they corrected of their errors. Thus the faith in those parts continued long after pure and untainted."*

But not only are we indebted to S. Germanus for thus preserving the British Church from heresy; we also owe to him many other blessings. He was the means of introducing schools and colleges of Christian education; he consecrated and sent forth many new bishops; and he was the means of introducing the Gallican liturgy.

As to the former, we do not hear of any collegiate or monastic institutions before the time of S. Germanus; but immediately afterwards they seem to have sprung up in various places. We read that—

"Germanus and Lupus having suppressed the Pelagian heresy, consecrated bishops in several parts of Britain, and among the rest, they erected a cathedral at Llandaff, and made Dubricius Archbishop, who fixed his disciples in several churches. For this purpose, he made Daniel Bishop of Bangor, and disposed of Iltutus at a place called after him, 'Llan Iltut,' or the church of Iltutus." †

And mention is made of the number of disciples and scholars that resorted to him for learning from all parts of the country; and of colleges founded by him, specially Hentland on the Wye,

* Bede, "Hist. Eccl." lib. i. cap. ii.

† Chronicles in Leland's Collect. vol. ii. p. 42.

where he had upwards of a thousand pupils; Llancarfan, Caerworgorn, and Caerleon. The Welsh word "Bangor," or "Banchor," means college; and this word remains even to this day as the name of a British See. Bangor-Garmon, or the College of S. Germanus, at Llanveithin, in Glamorganshire, was founded by that holy bishop in the year 460.

And as to the latter point, the introduction of the Gallican liturgy. This also is a very remarkable and important testimony to the integrity of the British Church. What liturgy she used before the time of S. Germanus, there are no records or even tradition to show; but probably, from the customs of keeping Easter, of which we shall have to speak hereafter, and from the peculiar tonsure used by the priests, it was of oriental origin. Now, however, from the time of S. Germanus, we find distinct traces of the Gallican liturgy prevailing in the British churches. These traces have been handed down to us, even at the present day; and the English Prayer-Book stands conspicuous in many instances as following the Gallican use.

But all this, as was said before, the preaching of God's Word, the foundation of additional bishoprics, and the institution of Colleges, was cramped and hindered, if not in great part destroyed, by the inroads of that fearful paganism which the barbarous Saxons introduced. From the year 450 to the year 596, the Britons

declined, and the Saxons took their place. With some few exceptions, as in the achievements of King Arthur (most of which however are esteemed to be fabulous,) and some few others, the tide of war rushed in full flood over the fruitful land of Britain; and the ancient British people, together with the ancient British Church, was to be found principally in *Wales*. There, however, she *was* still to be found, declining, weak, and crippled; but still alive. Of this we shall have to speak in a short time.

The point for us now to observe is this: Whatever deficiencies and shortcomings may have been in her, there is one remarkable proof of the integrity and independence of the British Church, that all through her most severe temporal trials, as well as her spiritual heresy, she never appealed in any one case, either for protection or for guidance, to the Church of Rome; nor, on the other hand, did the Church of Rome in any way interfere to throw over her the protection, or the guidance which she needed. That time was yet to come. For the present, it was to the synods and to the Bishops of the *Church of Gaul* that she appealed, and from them, and them only, she received the assistance which she required. For her many grievous sins: the great declension of her kings, her people, and her clergy, from the holiness of the Gospel; and more especially for the great sin of neglecting, as her office and commission was, to evangelise the pagan

Saxons, she afterwards did most amply suffer —but for the present, and clearly and conclusively up to the year of our Lord 596, the voice of the Church of Rome had never been heard as of any authority in Britain.

CHAPTER V.

The Islands of "Britain," so called by the ancient geographers, contained within them three principal nations as their original inhabitants. In the first place, Britannia, or the southern part, contained the primitive Britons; secondly, Hibernia, or Ireland, the western part, contained the primitive Scots; and thirdly, Caledonia, or the northern part, contained the Picts. As the Church of Christ was first preached among these several people so it grew up, but there was a continual interchange and passage of the various bishops and preachers of the Gospel from one part of it to another; and many times it would happen that the inhabitants of one portion of the islands would owe their conversion to some eminent man making his way among them from another portion with which originally they had no connection. When the Saxons had succeeded in establishing their dominion over the southern and midland divisions of Britain, the ancient Church of the country was confined to the three remaining portions of it, namely, first to Wales,

or the western part of Britain; second, to Ireland; and third, to Caledonia. It will be interesting to learn how in each of these divisions the Christian Faith had been propagated, and was still maintained towards the close of the sixth century.

I. First then as to Ireland. It appears that before the year 400, several churches had been founded in the south of Ireland, but that still nearly the whole of the north and west provinces remained in paganism. The conversion of Ireland was thus much later than that of England. In the year 431, Palladius was consecrated, and sent by Pope Celestine to the converted Scots in Ireland; but he did not make much progress, being persecuted and driven out from the place where he had settled by the savage inhabitants of the country. It was reserved for S. Patricius or Patrick to become, as he has ever been called, the Apostle of Ireland. S. Patrick was born in North Britain or Caledonia, son of Calpurinus a deacon, and grandson of Potitus a priest, and the great S. Martin, Bishop of Tours, was his uncle. When sixteen years of age he was taken prisoner by some Irish pirates, and was condemned to the hardest servitude as a common prisoner. From this circumstance he learned the habits and the language of the Irish, and was enabled the more readily in after life to become their great converter and preacher. At length he

escaped into Gaul, was there ordained deacon by S. Martin, and afterwards priest by that S. Germanus of whom we spoke before as the deliverer of the British Church from the heresy of Pelagius. Two accounts are given us of the elevation of S. Patrick to the episcopate—one that he was consecrated and sent on his mission to Ireland by Pope Celestine, another that he owes his consecration to Amandus, Archbishop of Bourdeaux. The latter account is supported by many writers of repute, but more especially by the learned Roman Catholic writer Dr. Lanigan.* The general tendency of the historians is, that in some way S. Patrick came into Ireland from Gaul and not from Italy. He first preached the Gospel in Cornwall, thence penetrated into Wales, and subsequently made his way over into Ireland. To this great saint is entirely owing the conversion of the Irish as a Church. He elected and consecrated bishops, established synods, and fixed the metropolitan see at Armagh. By his untiring efforts, his wonderful success in preaching, and by his great courage in opposing himself to the attacks of persecutors, the influence of his name pervaded the whole country. A letter written by him, in which he calls himself "the bishop established in Ireland," excommunicates a native Prince Coroticus and his followers as robbers and murderers. This letter, together

* Lanigan, vol. i. p. 191.

with another writing, called "The Confession," is still extant, and is pronounced by the ablest critics to be the genuine writing of the Apostle of Ireland. He died in the year 493, and was buried at Down in Ulster. Nennius relates that he founded three hundred and sixty-five churches, and consecrated three hundred and sixty-four bishops, besides three thousand presbyters. And what is more remarkable, as indicating the very rapid progress of the Church in Ireland, numerous missionaries were sent forth among the Saxons in Germany, and Normans in Gaul; and many illustrious men in after times as preachers of the Gospel owe their origin to the "Island of Saints," namely S. Columbanus, S. Columba, S. Kilian, S. Aidan, S. Finian, and many others whose names are familiar to the students of the early Irish history. It is also said that the bishopric of the Isle of Man owes its origin to the labours of S. Patrick, who sent over to that island many bishops in succession. The bishopric of Man can boast of what very few of our bishoprics in Britain can do, an uninterrupted succession as a separate see for more than 1,400 years.

II. Let us next consider the Church of Scotland, or Caledonia. The disputes among antiquaries as to the origin of the two great tribes of Picts and Scots, those two great northern enemies of the Britons, is endless. Upon the whole we may gather thus much; that the Picts consist of the

ancient inhabitants of the North, and were probably identical with the whole or certainly a part of those who were formerly called Caledonians; and gave their name to that portion of the land which lies north of the Tweed:—

Dr. Lingard says:—

"The Scots came undoubtedly from Ireland, which, like its sister island, appears to have been colonized by adventurers from different countries. . . . . These were scattered on different parts of the coast, while the interior was held by numerous clans of the *Scoti*, many of whom, in the fourth century, united with the Attacotti, a kindred clan in the neighbourhood of Loch Lomond, to plunder the rich provinces of the Roman Britons. But the Scots soon aspired to something more permanent than plunder. From the north of Ireland the passage was short and inviting. Hordes of adventurers followed each other. Settlements were obtained from the friendship or extorted from the weakness of the Picts; and at last the strangers acquired so marked a superiority over the indigenous tribes, as to impart the name of Scotland to the northern divisions of Britain." *

As S. Patrick was the Apostle of the Irish, so undoubtedly S. Ninian was of the Scotch. In the commencement of the fifth century, Ninias or Ninian was a native of North Wales, of noble

* Lingard's History, ch. i.

family. He was early distinguished for his abstinence, his learning, and his piety. He visited and corresponded with S. Martin, and was probably ordained by him, and sent on the work of the Gospel. Some, however, as in the case of S. Patrick, affirm that he received his mission from Rome. But whether from Gaul or from Italy, certain it is that this holy man was the first to preach the Gospel among the southern Picts; that he established a Church among them, and was himself their first bishop. It is said that he built the first church of stone that had ever been seen in Britain; from thence called "Whiteherne," or "Candida casa," (the white house.) From thence his apostolical labours carried him through all the southern portion of Scotland, and great numbers of the heathens flocked to his preaching and his baptism. This, however, does but regard the southern part of Scotland; for it was not until nearly two centuries after the coming of S. Ninian, that any impression was made upon the northern Picts, those rude and savage mountaineers, traces of whom are even still remaining in the Highlands.

It was in the year 563, that Colum M'Felim M'Fergus, a man of royal birth, but preferring the cowl to the diadem, left the shores of Ireland, and landed in a currach (an Irish boat, made of wicker-work and hides), and with a crew of twelve men, took possession of Iona or Hy, a small island on the north-west of Scotland. He soon con-

verted the savage natives of the island, and built a monastery of which he became the Abbot. From thence, he and his monks, issuing forth to the main land, spread through all the North of Scotland the doctrine of the Gospel.

Bede thus describes it:—

"Columba came into Britain in the ninth year of the reign of Bridius, ... a powerful king of the Pictish nation; and he converted that people to the faith of Christ by his preaching and example: whereupon he also received of them the aforesaid island (Iona) for a monastery. . . . . Before he passed over into Britain he had built a noble monastery in Ireland, which, from the great number of oaks, is called in the Scottish tongue, 'Dearm-ach,' the field of oaks. From both which monasteries, many others had their beginning through his disciples, both in Britain and Ireland."*

Thus much then we learn in a general and rough way of the foundation of the Church in two great portions of the British Islands. It will be necessary for the reader to remember carefully what has been set forth; because, from these two foundations, namely S. Patrick for Ireland, and S. Ninian and Columba for Scotland, we shall have occasion to observe hereafter the succession of bishops for the British Churches.

* Bede, "Eccl. Hist." lib. iii. cap. 4.

III. We must now pass to the remaining and third portion of the Church; namely, that which was more properly British—driven out from her just inheritance by the Saxons, and taking shelter in Wales and Cornwall.

At the time of the Saxon irruption, A.D. 450, it is recorded that Theanus, Bishop of London, and Thadiacus, Bishop of York, were compelled to fly for safety, and left their sees deserted. It is most probable that all the other bishops did likewise; and that assembling together in a more concentrated band, in the fastnesses of the West, they still maintained the doctrines and practised the devotions of the Church. Occasionally, however, as any success in battle over the Saxons gave them opportunity, they seem from time to time to have returned and re-established their bishoprics. But all was accidental, uncertain, and temporary; for the whole land, for many years, was but one continued scene of pillage and destruction, which ended only in the final triumph of the Saxons. We may mention the following instances of this great struggle, continuing from the year of the first entrance into Britain of Hengist and Horsa, A.D. 450, down to very nearly the close of the sixth century.

Emrys Wledig, so called in Welsh, but in the Latin, Ambrosius; being partly of British and partly of Roman extraction, as his name betokens; took the lead as the chief opposer of the Saxon hordes. With varied success he at length

defeated them in a pitched battle, and Hengist was slain. An interval of peace succeeded, in which Ambrosius convened a council of the clergy at York, and it was agreed that the churches which had been destroyed should be restored and rebuilt. He then visited London, Winchester, and Salisbury, and at the suggestion of Tramor, Bishop of Caerleon, either built or restored to its position the great structure of Stonehenge, in memory of the fearful slaughter that had taken place there of the British in the time of Vortigern. In this interval of peace he also elevated Dyvrig or Dubricius to the See of Caerleon, vacant by the death of Tramor, and Samson to the See of York. This success was however but for a short time. It is merely given as an instance how in the midst of struggles the Church was still maintained.

About the year 500, Ambrosius died, and was succeeded by Uthyr, who was called Pendragon, or generalissimo. He prosecuted the war with great courage and some success; but the Saxons, under Cerdic, pillaged and destroyed the monastery at Winchester, and turned the church into a temple of Dagon. His son, the illustrious Arthur, succeeded him, and was crowned king by Dubricius, Archbishop of Caerleon; while closely after we find S. Dewi or David, upon the death of Dubricius, succeeding to the See of Caerleon.

Of Dubricius we read that he "preached and gave instructions to the clergy and people; his

doctrine shining through all Britain as a candle on a candlestick."* In the year 470 he was appointed Bishop of Llandaf, then raised to the See of Caerleon, which he held for some time in conjunction with Llandaf. In the year 519 he joined Deiniol or Daniel, then Bishop of Bangor, in persuading David to confront the Pelagians, who were then disturbing the land with their heresy. After this he resigned Caerleon, and David became its bishop. He died in the year 522.

But we must speak more particularly of this David, the patron Saint of Wales. Receiving his early education at the school of Illtyd, then famous as a chief seminary of learning, he was ordained priest by Albeus, Bishop of Munster. He visited Jerusalem, and upon his return built a monastery at Menevia, where he devoted himself to prayer and retirement. From this, as before related, he was drawn forth to confute the Pelagian heresy at the synod of Brevi, in Cardiganshire. Succeeding to the Bishopric of Caerleon, he transferred the Metropolitan See to his favourite monastery at Menevia, afterwards called from this very bishop S. David's, the seat of the present bishopric, which goes by that name in the English Church. S. David died in the year 544.

Next to him we must speak of S. Padarn, who first came into Wales from the Gallican Church

---

* Life of S. Dubricius. Liber Landavensis.

in Armorica. He founded a Bishop's See in Cardiganshire, where he ruled as bishop twenty-one years. He was afterwards appointed to the Bishopric of Vannes, in his native country, whither he retired in his old age to die.

Next to him S. Teilo. Under the patronage of Dubricius, he opened a college at Llandaf, and after the resignation of Dubricius was made Bishop of that See, and afterwards again of Menevia. But he transferred the seat of the metropolitan authority from Menevia to Llandaf. Of these three illustrious prelates there is an account in the Welsh Triads; the bards joining them together in one song of praise.

"The three blessed *visitors* of the Isle of Britain, Dewi, Padarn, and Teilo. They were so called because they went as guests to the houses of the noble, the plebeian, the native, and the stranger, without accepting either fee or reward, or victuals, or drink; but what they did was to teach the faith in CHRIST to every one without pay or thanks. Besides which, they gave to the poor and needy gifts of their gold and silver, their raiment and provisions."*

To S. Teilo succeeded in the See of Llandaf and primacy of the British Church S. Oudaceus, who convened three several synods for the regulation of discipline. It is also recorded of him,

* Triad 19. Quoted in "Ecclesiastical Antiquities of the Cymry."

that he excommunicated, on account of murder and other heinous crimes, Mouricus, king of Glamorganshire; but dying before the king had fulfilled his required penance, the king received absolution from Berthguin, the next in order in the See of Llandaf.

Next to these, we may more shortly speak of S. Paulinus, A.D. 480, patron Saint of Llangor, in Brecknockshire, conspicuous in his labours against the Pelagians. He is mentioned in the old Welsh Calendar as Polin Esgol, *i.e.* Paulinus the Bishop.

And of Gildas, who originally of the College of Llandcarvan, and well known as an instructor of youth, yet was afterwards more celebrated as an historian of the age he lived in. He removed to Glastonbury, and there composed his "History of the Britons."

And of Samson, chief of the College of Illtyd; and afterwards retiring to Armorica, he became Bishop of Dole. He returned however to his native country, and died in the College of Illtyd.

And of Deiniol, who founded many monasteries, and built many churches, more especially the monastery of Bangor Iscoed. He is commemorated in the Triads as one of the three blessed youth trainers of the Isle of Britain.

Also of Kentigern, who came from the north, having founded the Bishopric of Glasgow. Having ruled there sometime as primate of the Clydesdale Britons, but afterwards retiring to Wales in the

troubles of the Picts and Scots, he founded the See of Llanelwy in Flintshire. He was so celebrated for his gentle and amiable disposition, that he was called "Mwyngu," which is the Welsh word for "amiable." The English reader may recognise him in the better-known title of S. Mungo.*

Nor must we pass over S. Asaf, who founded the Church of Llanasa, succeeding Kentigern in his bishopric, and transmitting to us, as in the case of S. David, the name of a Welsh See still remaining to this present day.

And last of all, passing over from Wales to Cornwall, we must not neglect S. Piran, of whom a record was but lately found on the north coast, in a parish still bearing a name of that Saint. The Church, "Llan Piran," or "church of S. Piran," otherwise called "Peran Zabuloe," was but a few years since restored from the bosom of the ocean, having been buried in the sand for many centuries. There it remains to this day; by its very name, and by the name of the parish in which it stands, bearing witness to the truth of the ancient British Church.

And after all, this is but a short list of the Welsh Bishops of ancient times. There were hundreds more, who, all along the troublous Saxon times, "earnestly contended for the faith," and strove to maintain the Church of Jesus

* Rees—Welsh Saints.

Christ. Great irregularities indeed there were, and many blemishes among them; first and principally the strange and unaccountable deficiency in the zeal, which we should have expected of them, as a body, in evangelizing their enemies the Saxons, but this, perhaps, may be accounted for by reasons of which no record remains. But nevertheless, considering the times in which they lived, they are bright spots—holy testimonies of a light beaming within—sure proofs of God, in the midst of His wrath, not having altogether deserted His people.

And carefully must the reader remember, that all this light of the Church was shining *before a thought was breathed of any intercourse with Rome.* Look to the North—the Picts and Scots. Look to the West—the bishops and monks of the Cymry. Look to the West again—the Church of the Irish. Consider S. Ninian in the lowlands; S. Columba in the highlands of Scotland. Look at S. Patrick, the great Apostle of the Irish; or take S. David, the patron Saint of the Welsh. Look at the numerous monasteries, colleges, cathedrals, that fill the map of Wales; some of whose sites are yet to be traced; and some whose records still remain to us, as furnishing the names of our very present sees; for instance the Isle of Man; Llandaf; S. David's; and S. Asaf; also in the North, Glasgow; and now lately reviving, bearing the names of the ancient Saints, the colleges of S. Columba and S. Ninian.

Look well to this; and with it reflect, that when all these things took place, while these holy men lived, and these great contests with the enemy of souls were agitated in the shape of war, pillage, and devastation; while the gods of heathenism, and gods of vice in the hearts of the wicked and the profane, were doing battle on all sides; simply reflect, that *not a voice from Rome had ever been heard in Britain, as of any authority in the Church.* It was to come indeed very soon; but *as yet* it had not come. There was no authority advanced; neither was there any authority recognised for guidance or for help throughout the British Churches, but the One Universal authority of the Church Catholic of CHRIST, together with the voice of the Word of GOD, which spake in His Holy Scriptures, delivered and interpreted by that Universal Church.

CHAPTER VI.

ABOUT the year of our LORD 580, some Saxon children from the Isle of Britain were to be sold as slaves in the market-place of Rome. Gregory, then Archdeacon of the city, under Pope Benedict I., passing by, was struck by the appearance of the children; and loth to imagine that such fair countenances as he then beheld should suffer the degradation of slavery, he stopped and asked the question: "Whence come these captives?"

To which the slave-merchant replied: "From the Isle of Britain." And when Gregory enquired further: "Are these islanders Christians?" the answer was: "O no, they are Pagans." "It is sad," said Gregory, that the author of darkness should possess men with such fair faces. But of what particular nation are they?" "They are called 'Angli.'" Gregory answered: "And well may they, for they have angel faces. In what province of Britain do they live?" "In Deira."* "They must be redeemed De ira Dei. How call ye the king of that Province?" "Ella." Then said Gregory: "Surely Allelujah ought to be sung in such a country to the praise of the God Who created all things."

And upon this the holy man repaired to the Pope, and begged to be sent forthwith on a mission to convert the Angles, or English. But it was not the will of God. Time rolled on; Pelagius succeeded Benedict as Pope, and ten years more saw that very Gregory elevated to the Episcopal throne, vacated by Pelagius, while the history of the Saxon slaves still remained vividly impressed upon his mind. What he urged then on the impulse of a benevolent heart, full of the love of Christ, but was not permitted to obtain, he now, as the head of the Roman Church, was

* Deira was the name of the Saxon Province, and *De Ira* Dei is the Latin for "*From the wrath* of God."

enabled to fulfil; with this difference, however, that he could not now, from his position, become, in his own person, the evangelizer of the English. There was, however, another, by whose mediation that which was at his heart was readily fulfilled. To Augustine, with forty other monks, S. Gregory, afterwards, and most justly, from the eminence of his character, called "The Great," gave his episcopal mission, and sent them forth to preach the Gospel of CHRIST to the Pagan Saxons.

S. Augustine set forth, and after some impediments, and some weak fears concerning the danger of the voyage, in which however he was rebuked and encouraged by S. Gregory, he arrived with his company of monks at the Isle of Thanet on the coast of Kent. Meanwhile, the Saxons, to whom he was sent, were not altogether unprepared for him. Ethelbert was at that time Bretwalda, that is, chief of the Saxon kings, and exercised the principal dominion throughout the whole country. He was married to Bertha, daughter of Charibert, King of Paris. This lady was herself a Christian, and had come over from France with an express stipulation that she should be allowed the free use of her religion. Accordingly she had caused a deserted church in Canterbury, dedicated to S. Martin, to be restored to its sacred uses, and there with a little company, presided over by Luidhard, Bishop of Senlis, both by her holy life and her strict devo-

tions she had attracted the favourable notice of her husband's subjects. It was not then to a very untried spot that Augustine the monk had come, nor were the hearts of many, as it would seem, altogether hardened to the first voice of his preaching. Now it may appear at first sight an unaccountable thing that with the Church of Gaul so close, wherein for many centuries the light of CHRIST had freely shone; with the Church also of the ancient British people, of whose discipline and doctrine we have such sure testimonies, only separated by the mountains of Wales; it may seem a strange thing that no efforts had been put forth by either of these Churches to evangelize the Saxons, whose Paganism and savage life were the theme of distant lands. And so indeed it had appeared to S. Gregory himself, for he had before written letters to Theodoric, and Theodebut, Kings of the Franks, to expostulate with them on this neglect. "We are informed," he says, "that through the mercy of GOD, the English nation is desirous to turn Christian; but the clergy of your nation, notwithstanding your neighbourhood, refuse to assist them in their good motions, and to encourage their piety. *

It is not improbable that S. Gregory's acquaintance with these facts was derived from Bertha, the wife of Ethelbert. But be this as it may, it

* Gregor. Epistolæ, lib. v. c. 58.

is clearly not only a justification of S. Gregory in the mission of S. Augustine, but more than this, it became thereby his positive duty, as a Christian bishop, not to leave so vast a mass of heathenism, as the Saxon people then presented to the eyes of the world, unvisited by the voice of CHRIST. If the ancient Church of the country had neglected from any national pride or reluctance; or if the adjoining Church of Gaul, so intimately connected with Britain as we have already seen, had neglected from indolence to perform this manifestly Christian duty; then it fell to S. Gregory to do as he did. And therefore it is, that without regard to the misfortunes which afterwards befel the Church, and the errors which sullied her purity, (for these no one at that time could possibly foresee,) it is right that we give all praise to S. Gregory, and all honour to S. Augustine, as the first evangelizers of the pagan Saxons in the ancient kingdom of Britain.

But how did things proceed? Truly indeed had these missionaries a great work to do, for the Paganism of the Saxons was of the basest and most revolting kind, and most remarkable it is that even to this day there lives the testimony of our degradation as a Saxon people in the very names by which we designate the days of our week. First, there was *Thor* or *Thur*, who was represented under the image of a large corpulent man, wearing a crown of gold, corresponding with the Roman Jupiter; he lives in our Thurs-

day. Next, there was *Woden*, an image of a man in armour, corresponding with Mars; he lives in our Woden, or Wednesday. Next, there was *Friga*, represented under an indecent image, goddess of generation, corresponding with the Roman Venus. She lives in our Friday. Add to which there was a goddess Eoster, or Goster, who is described by Bede as a divinity receiving a peculiar worship in the spring time. She lives in our Easter. But not only were there such gods as these made objects of worship, but the religion of the Saxons taught them to indulge in human sacrifices. They slew every tenth captive whom they took in war. There were also many other atrocities and impurities made part of their religion of which we need not speak. Truly, then, had Augustine the monk a notable work to do, a work which Holy Scripture had long ago described, the casting of these "idols of silver and gold which they had made each one for himself to worship, to the moles and to the bats;" and faithfully and wisely did he perform it.

But he had first to deal with the king. Elthelbert having notice of the approach of S. Augustine, desired that the meeting should be in the open air. This he did from the Saxon superstition, lest any arts of magic might be intended to be practised against him. The missionary approached with his forty companions, bearing before him a banner with the picture of our Blessed Lord upon it, and chanting solemn litanies for

God's mercy in the conversion of the heathen. The king replied that "their promises were fair, but because new to him, he could not give assent to what was said without further time for deliberation; that he could not abandon of a sudden the ancient customs of the English. But since they were strangers coming from a distant country to communicate to him such things as they thought were good, he would not forbid any converts, whom their preaching might persuade to their opinions, and also he would provide for them comfortable accommodation." *

Nothing could be more propitious than such an answer as this. The way seemed open to them by the mercy of God, and with great gladness they went forward on their work, bearing the holy cross, and chanting as they entered the city of Canterbury, the metropolis of the king's dominions, these words: "We beseech Thee, O Lord, in all Thy mercy, that Thy anger and wrath may be turned away from this city, and from Thy holy house, because we have sinned: Hallelujah."

On the east side of the city stood the church of S. Martin, the place which Queen Bertha,† and those of her court who were Christians, used for their worship. Here S. Augustine and his brother monks continually preached, received converts,

* Bede, "Eccles. Hist." lib. i. cap. cxxv.
† Idem.

and baptised multitudes of people, until at length the king himself, acknowledging the truth of the holy missionary's words, became a Christian.

"Thus," says Fuller, "was Kent converted to Christianity. To such as account this a conversion of all England, to make their words good, do make use of a long and strong synecdoche, taking a part for the whole; for more than half the land was lying some years after in the darkness of Paganism, which others afterwards enlightened with the beams of the Gospel. But as he is esteemed the architect or master workman, not who builds up most of the wall, but who first designeth the fabric, and layeth the foundation thereof; in the same respect Augustine carrieth away the credit of all that came after him, because he was the primitive planter of the Gospel among the Saxons. And it is observable that this conversion was done without any persecution; yea, without any considerable opposition, costing some pain, no torture; some sweat, no blood; not one martyr being made in the whole managing thereof. Meantime, as to the poor Christian Britons living peaceably at home, these enjoyed God, the Gospel, and their mountains, little skilful in, and less caring for, the ceremonies *à la mode* brought over by Augustine; and indeed their poverty could not go to the cost of Augustine's silver cross, which made them worship the God of their fathers after their own homely but hearty fashion; not willing to dis-

turb Augustine and his followers in their new rites; had he not had a mind to disquiet them in their old service, as in the sequel of this history will appear."*

But it was needful that Augustine, having now made his footing in the land, should be invested with further authority, and with higher appearances of rank. Accordingly he returned to France, visited the Bishop of Arles, and from him received the ordination of a Bishop. Fortified with this higher authority, under the title of "Anglorum Episcopus," Bishop of the English; and furthermore receiving from S. Gregory at Rome many specific directions as to points of discipline in the Church, he returned, and from that moment commenced a deeper system of conversion throughout the whole land. Whether he had previously learnt the existence of the Church in Britain does not, for anything that is said on his first arrival, appear; but certainly if S. Gregory his master, or even he himself, had been but tolerably versed in the history of the Councils of the Church, and specially of the heresy of Pelagius, he would have recognised it. But be this as it may, he was soon made aware of it; and as far as appearances went seemed at first to acknowledge it. He immediately invited Dinooth, Abbot of Bangor-Iscoed, chief among the scholars of that monastery, to a conference, and besought

* Fuller, vol. i. p. 141.

him, with seeming sincerity, to join him in preaching the Gospel to the Saxons.

The Abbot replied that "he did not think it worthy to preach to that cruel people who had treacherously slain their parents, and robbed them of their just and legitimate property." He maintained, moreover, that as to S. Augustine himself, "he could not associate with him; for that, under GOD, he could be in subjection to no other person than the Archbishop of Caerleon, his rightful metropolitan."

The first part of this answer we cannot but regret, and it seems to give us the key to the whole conduct of the British Church in abstaining from all attempts to enlighten their Saxon conquerors; but as to the latter part, on that simple question turns, and did turn for many long years afterwards, the rightful authority of the Church in this land. S. Augustine, however, did not rest here, neither did the British bishops. Each party claimed the right of jurisdiction, and neither would give way to the other. S. Augustine, fortified by the title of Archbishop of Canterbury, which title and office he had assumed by the direction of the Pope, might maintain on his side that the right to preside over the Church lay with him; that coming, as he did, into a land of heathens, and, by the grace of GOD, converting them to the Gospel, he was rightly the representative of the Church; that he had not reaped the fruits of other men's sowing; but being him-

self appointed bishop for this purpose, he had taught, preached, and baptised those who, till his coming, knew not CHRIST; that consequently, by the decree and authority of the Church, he was rightly the chief pastor thereof. On the other hand, the British bishops might assert that their absence from the Saxon heathens was but accidental and temporary; that for centuries they, as lawful bishops, had ruled and governed the Church in Britain, in strict accordance with the Canons; that their sees were known and recognised by the Church universal; that not longer than ten years had Theonus, Archbishop of London, retired from his see, and that only under persecution; that he was therefore still the lawful bishop of that territory; and that as to other portions of the island, specially towards the north, there was Thadiacus, Bishop of York; and in the west there were many bishops who had never been interrupted in the regular succession, more especially the Archbishop of Caerleon, their own metropolitan; that therefore they on their part must claim to resist the aggression of S. Augustine and Pope Gregory, and adhere to the only lawful jurisdiction which was before them.

With such a spirit as this it was that, by the influence of Ethelbert, King of Kent, now a disciple of S. Augustine, the two contending parties met together, and held a solemn conference on the disputed points. It was in the year of our LORD 603, at a place called ever after S. Augus-

tine's Oak, on the borders of the West Saxons, (Worcestershire,) that this conference was held. Many entreaties and exhortations to unity were urged by the Roman party, but all in vain. The Britons declared that they could not rightly accede to the conditions required of them; but still, somewhat softened, they desired time for consultation with their brethren, and requested that another meeting might be convened on some future day.

Accordingly a second conference was held not long after, and at this conference seven British bishops appeared. They were probably the Bishops of Llandaff, Hereford, Llanbadarn, Bangor, S. Asaph, Worcester, and Margam. To these were added many learned men from the monastery of Bangor-Iscoed, presided over by Dinooth their Abbot. It is very evident that before the conference the minds of the British bishops were not disaffected towards the demands of S. Augustine; for, in order to determine their course of action, they had applied to a certain hermit, of great repute and wisdom, and he directed them to this effect:—"If Augustine be a man of God, follow him." They urged the difficulty of ascertaining whether he really were a man of God. He replied:—"The Lord hath said, 'Take My yoke upon you, for I am meek and lowly in heart.' If, therefore, Augustine is meek and lowly in heart, it is to be expected, that because he bears himself the yoke of Christ, he will offer it to be borne by

you; but if he is not meek, but proud, it is clear that he is not of God." They urged again: "And how shall we discover this?" "Contrive," he said, "that S. Augustine and his friends should come first to the place of synod. If he shall rise when you approach, hearken to him obediently, knowing that he is the servant of Christ; but if he shall despise you, and be not willing to rise in your presence, whereas you are more in number, then let him be rejected by you."*

The day arrived, and at the time appointed S. Augustine and his monks, bearing the standard of the cross, and singing canticles and litanies according to the Roman use, entered the place of synod. Then appeared the British bishops. S. Augustine, seated in his chair of state, made no sign of rising, but addressed them in the following words:—

"Seeing in many things ye act contrary to our custom, and to that of the universal Church, yet if ye will obey me in these three points, that ye celebrate Easter at the proper time; that ye complete the service of baptism (by which we are born again unto God) after the manner of the holy Roman and Apostolic Church, and jointly with us preach the word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all the other things ye do, though contrary to our custom."

To this Dinooth, Abbot of Bangor, was deputed to answer, and he did so in the following words:—

* Bede, "Eccles. Hist." lib. ii. c. 2.

"Be it known, without doubt, unto you, that we all are, every one of us, obedient subjects to the Church, and to the Bishop of Rome, and to every godly Christian; to love every one in his degree in perfect charity: but other obedience than this, we do not know to be due to him whom you name as Pope; nor do we recognise him to be father of fathers, as claimed and demanded. This obedience we are ready to give, and pay to him, and to every Christian continually. Besides, we are under the government of the Bishop of Caerlon-upon-Usk, who is to oversee us, under GOD, to cause us to keep the way spiritual."

Thus, then, the conference terminated. S. Augustine retiring to Canterbury, where he continued his work of evangelising the Saxons independently of the British Church; and the British bishops retiring into Wales, still carrying on, as best they could, the works of their Church, independently of the claimed jurisdiction of the Bishop of Rome.

Such, even in these early times, was the unhappy division between two portions of CHRIST'S Catholic Church. It was a very small thread which marked the line between them. Each, beyond doubt, imagined that they were promoting the cause which they had at heart; and each, in the main, was sincerely anxious for the advancement of the faith of CHRIST. But from this over zeal how much misery has sprung. It is clear that no point of doctrine divided them.

No heresy was laid to the door of the British bishops. The only points in dispute were questions of ceremony and of discipline.

Lingard, though a Romanist author, yet distinctly testifies as to the perfect identity of doctrine between the Churches.

"It is surprising that so many modern historians should have represented the Britons as holding different doctrines from those professed by the Roman Missionaries, though these writers have never yet produced a single instance of such difference. Would Augustine have required the British clergy to join in the conversion of the Saxons, if they had taught doctrines which he had condemned? Bede has related with great minuteness all the controversies between the two parties, they all regard points of discipline. Nowhere does the remotest hint occur of any difference respecting doctrine."*

But the question of discipline involved the whole subject of the jurisdiction of the See of Rome; and that, in reality, was the subject in dispute. If the points demanded by S. Augustine had merely affected the customs of Easter and of Baptism, it is clear from the first conference that communion might have been easily established; but when from the second conference these customs were too evidently demanded as marks of submission and inferiority to the See of

* Lingard, ch. ii., note.

Rome, as it was said by S. Augustine : "*if ye will obey me in these three points;*" then the British bishops felt that such a concession would have been a denial of their own canonical ordination, and an abandonment of their whole rights as a national Church. We shall see hereafter how this worked. Sufficient for the present that S. Augustine, contrary to the Canons of Nice, of Constantinople, and of Antioch, those great Councils of the Catholic Church, did set up against the British bishops a foreign authority, and demanded an obedience to which he had no right. As a missionary, preaching to the heathens, he was justified in the conversion of the Saxons; but as a bishop, entering upon a diocese already established, and demanding the submission of a Church which had existed at least four centuries, there was no justification. Had it pleased Almighty God that the hearts of the British bishops had been moved earlier towards the conversion of the Saxons, this great and irreparable evil would never have arisen. The unity of the British Church within herself would never have been disturbed; and the records of our faith, divided and torn by intestine discord and confusion, would never have sullied the pages of the historian. This, however, was not God's will.

It only remains for us to record the death of S. Augustine, which took place in the year 605. He was buried in the north porch of the Cathedral Church of SS. Peter and Paul; a church which

was then in course of erection, and which afterwards became the metropolitan church of the See Canterbury.

CHAPTER VII.

The death of S. Augustine made no clearer pathway either for the advancement of the Christian faith or for the Unity of the Church. There were now three great parties into which the land was divided. In the West the fugitive British bishops maintained with a characteristic pertinacity the ancient rights of their Church, and rested upon their primitive apostolical succession. In the North the Scottish Church, which had come down either from S. Patrick or from S. Ninian, and boasted among its chief men S. Columba, the founder of the great monastery of Iona, was not without its claim for antiquity, and the maintenance of true catholic teaching. While in the South, the new Roman party succeeding to the episcopacy of S. Augustine was busy in the general advancement of the Faith among the heathen Saxons. The two former of these parties were of like derivation as to apostolical succession, agreeing in the customs of Easter, and those other ritual matters which S. Augustine had in vain exhorted them to abandon; while the latter, although but a mere missionary Church amid heathens, claimed the obedience of

all, as coming from the Bishop of Rome, in whose name they preached, and from whom they claimed their jurisdiction.

The Saxon Heptarchy portioned out the whole island of Britain into seven small kingdoms, and between the princes of these several kingdoms, in their struggles for power or pre-eminence, the Christian religion swayed to and fro with alternate success. Sudden conversions of kings and people are at one time the signs of an apparent progress; while at another, national apostacies and utter disregard of the Faith, seems well-nigh about to quench and drive into despair every attempt to evangelize the people. In these struggles the different parties of the Church took their share, and it was indeed by means of these struggles, since it is God's mercy to bring good out of evil, that the whole island of Britain was ultimately converted to the Christian faith.

Before the death of S. Augustine care was taken on the part of the Roman section of the Church to provide for a successor in the See of Canterbury. Out of the company of monks and ecclesiastics sent over by Pope Gregory to assist S. Augustine, three seem to have taken a prominent position: Mellitus, who was consecrated a bishop, and placed in the See of London; Justus, who was consecrated to the See of Rochester; and Laurentius. Of the first, namely, Mellitus, we know that his position in the See of London was invalid, that see having still a bishop

of the British succession: but whether canonical or not, it was perfectly useless; for London, together with the whole of the East Saxons, remained long after the time of S. Augustine in complete heathen darkness; the inhabitants of what is now perhaps the greatest city in the world, for many years after the time of S. Augustine, stedfastly resisting all attempts at their conversion.

Laurentius, the third great fellow-workman with S. Augustine, was chosen by that prelate as his own successor, and very shortly proved himself no unworthy imitator of his zeal for the interests of the Roman party. His first act was to repeat the attempt of bringing the British and Scottish Churches to an agreement on the subject of Easter, but a greater failure attended him even than that which had followed the similar attempt of his predecessor. His letter on these matters to the Bishops of the Scots is thus given us by Bede:—

"To our most dear brothers, the lords bishops and abbots throughout all Scotland; Laurentius, Mellitus, and Justus, servants of the servant of God. When the Apostolic See, according to the universal custom which it has followed elsewhere, sent us to these western parts to preach to pagan nations, we came into this island, which is called Britain, without possessing any previous knowledge of its inhabitants. We hold both the Britons and Scots in great esteem for sanctity,

believing that they had proceeded according to the custom of the Universal Church: but becoming acquainted with the errors of the Britons, we thought the Scots had been better; but we have been informed by Bishop Dagan coming into this aforesaid island, and the Abbot Columbanus in France, that the Scots in no way differ from the Britons in their behaviour; for Bishop Dagan coming to us, not only refused to eat with us, but even to take his repast in the same house where we were entertained."*

A similar letter was written to the clergy of the British Church, but on both sides this renewed attempt at unity was equally futile. No attention was paid to it; and the authority of the Roman Church was for the second time unequivocally denied, both by the British and the Scots. The refusal of one of the bishops, Daganus, even to eat in the same house with the Roman bishops, proves how strongly the schism between them was maintained.

But the Church of S. Augustine was now to receive a severer blow even than this; for Ethelbert, King of Kent, and Seber, his nephew, King of the East Saxons, the only two royal supporters of the Roman party, were taken from this world about the year 616; and from that time, not only did the Gospel cease to be preached, but the ancient idolatry of the Saxons returned upon the

* Bede's "Eccl. History," book ii. c. 4.

whole land, overwhelming it with a flood of sin and wickedness. Eadbald, succeeding his father Ethelbert, although baptised, relapsed at once into idolatry, and became a pagan. The three sons of Seber, King of the West Saxons, refused not only to be baptised, but treated every office of the Christian religion with blasphemy and contempt. Seeing the white bread which was used in the holy service of the Eucharist, they demanded the Bishop Mellitus to give it to them. The Bishop said: "If ye will be washed in that laver of salvation in which your father was washed, ye may also partake of the holy Bread of which he partook; but if ye despise the laver, ye may not receive the Bread of Life." They replied: "We will not enter the laver of life because we do not know that we stand in need of it, and yet we would eat of that Bread." The end was, that Bishop Mellitus was driven out of the kingdom; and persecution arising on all sides, both in Kent as well as among the East Saxons, the three Roman bishops determined to abandon the cause of Christianity as hopeless, and to retire into France.

Mellitus and Justus did so immediately. But Laurentius remained for a short time; and as it is related by Bede, by way of preparation for his departure, determined to spend the night in his cathedral church in watching and prayer. During the night he had a vision of the Apostle Peter, who, as it was said, rebuked him most severely

for this cowardly desertion of his flock. Laurentius presented himself the next morning before the King Eadbald, with his body full of the marks of scourging, which he represented himself to have received in the night from the hands of the Apostle. The king, astonished at the sight, is related to have immediately repented of his sins, to have put away his adulterous intercourse, for which Laurentius had rebuked him (having married his father's wife), and then to have become a convert. Mellitus and Justus upon this returned from France; the one to Rochester, where he again resided as Bishop; but the other in vain attempted to regain the See of London, the Londoners preferring their idols and their idolatrous priests, before all the preaching of the bishops of the Christians.

Laurentius died in the year 619, and Mellitus succeeded him as the third Archbishop of Canterbury. But he did not live long, and Justus succeeded as the fourth Archbishop, in the year 624.

We must now turn from the Roman and southern part of England, to the Kingdom of the Angles, north of the Humber; for it was at first by a connection between the kingdoms of Kent and Northumbria that the blessings of Christianity were conferred upon that kingdom.

It was about the year 625 that Edwin, King of Northumbria, married Edelberga, daughter of Ethelbert, and sister of Eadbald, then the reign-

ing king. Edelberga, being a Christian, had been transferred to Northumbria with all the privileges of Christianity; and more especially she carried with her Paulinus, consecrated a bishop by the Roman party for that purpose. Paulinus, as a matter of course, endeavoured to advance the faith of CHRIST, combining with Edelberga to procure the baptism of the king. But for a long time all attempts were in vain. Neither the king nor any of the court would receive the teaching of Paulinus. And so things continued until, by what seemed an accident, it was GOD'S will to prepare a way for the holy bishop's success. Guichelm, King of the West Saxons, practised with an assassin for the murder of Edwin, who had long been his enemy. The attempt to commit the murder failed through the fidelity of one of the king's attendants, who interposed his own body to receive the wound intended for his royal master. This event, together with the queen's safe recovery after the birth of a daughter, which, as it seemed, had been attributed to the prayers of Paulinus, made a great impression upon the king. He put aside his idols, and immediately promised that if his arms should meet with success in the intended war against the West Saxons, which he undertook to avenge the attempted murder, he would at once become a Christian. But, notwithstanding the success which attended him, he still hesitated or withdrew from the promise. At length, how-

ever, a curious circumstance in the early life of Edwin came to the knowledge of Paulinus, and the sagacious Italian very soon turned it to his purpose.

Edwin in his early years had been a fugitive from the tyranny of Ethelfrid, his brother-in-law. Ethelfrid had unjustly deprived Edwin, then but a mere child, of his rightful inheritance, and had usurped his kingdom. It was told Paulinus how, in the course of Edwin's wandering to escape from the usurper, he sought shelter at the court of Redwald, King of the East Angles: and how he had been providentially saved by a miraculous vision of a stranger, who pointed out to him the means of safety. But the stranger, in his vision, had exacted of him a promise, marking it with the sign of laying his right hand on his head, that in his future life he would be guided by any adviser who should repeat that sign. Paulinus, taking advantage of this knowledge, and from day to day pressing with greater importunity upon the king, conducted his conversation so as to remind him of this circumstance, and at an opportune moment made use of the sacred sign. This story is related by Bede, who himself was a monk in the kingdom of Northumbria not more than one hundred and fifty years after the conversion of Edwin; so that it is perfectly reasonable to place reliance upon it as a matter of fact. Certain it is, that after this conversation, all else having failed, the queen's importunities, the

bishop's preaching, and a letter even received from Pope Boniface urging it, Edwin was at last a convert. He called together the priests of his former paganism; a solemn conference was held; and the king, together with his whole court, renounced the abominations of idolatry, and became Christians. He was baptised at York, where he quickly erected a temporary church of wood for that purpose, and which, being then made a Bishop's See, Paulinus was installed as the first bishop.

But from this first commencement of Christianity in the north, it is sad to think how the internal dissensions and wars of the several kings caused it very soon to decline.

For six years after the conversion of Edwin, the people pressed into the Church with seeming faithfulness and zeal, and multitudes were baptised. The pagan deities were set aside; and Paulinus travelling in the adjacent parts, even crossed the Humber, and converted many in Lincolnshire.

But here alas it ended; for Penda, King of the Mercians, a pagan, and Caedwella, King of the Britons, a Christian, losing sight of their differences in religion for the joint interest of subduing so powerful a Prince as Edwin, gave him battle at a place called Hatfield, between the Don and the Torre. Edwin and his army were destroyed. The victors entered upon his kingdom, put every thing to rout, and utterly subverted all the hopes

of the Christian Church. Queen Edelberga with her children fled back to Kent, seeking shelter at her brother's court; and Bishop Paulinus meeting with no support fled also with them, and never again returned to his new formed bishopric at York. The idolatry of paganism was thus restored in Northumbria. Most of those who had embraced Christianity, either for terror or for lukewarmness, succumbed beneath the new order of things, and the Church of Christ was abandoned.

We must now go back to Ethelfrid, the original usurper of the kingdom of Northumbria. When Edwin, the rightful heir, succeeded in expelling him, the children of Ethelfrid took refuge in Scotland, and receiving instruction from the Church there established, were baptised. Northumbria was at first divided, two princes of the race of Ethelfrid possessing the two portions of it; but they renouncing Christianity perished. Ultimately, Oswald, the younger son of Ethelfrid, ascended the throne of Northumbria, and became one of the most powerful princes of his time. Not forgetting the instruction of his youth in Christianity, he was determined at all hazards to bring it back as the religion of his kingdom. But so determining, it was not to Paulinus he applied as the former Bishop of York, nor to any of the Roman party in Kent; not to Honorius, who was now the fifth Archbishop of Canterbury, having succeeded Justus; not again to any of the British

bishops in Wales; but naturally enough it was to the Scots, among whom he had been educated, that he had recourse for bishops and missionaries to preach the faith of CHRIST. The first bishop who was sent was Aidan. It is remarkable that his see was placed, not at York, according to the plan of Pope Gregory, but, as though to signify his independence of Rome, at Lindisfarne, a small island at the north of the river Lindis. This was afterwards known by the name of Holy Island. Thus it is described by Bede:—

"On the arrival of the bishop, the king appointed him his episcopal see in the isle of Lindisfarne, as he desired. Which place, as the tide flows and ebbs twice a day, is enclosed by the waves of the sea like an island; and again, twice in the day, when the shore is left dry, becomes contiguous to the land. The king also humbly and willingly in all cases giving ear to his admonitions, industriously applied himself to build and extend the Church of CHRIST in his kingdom; wherein, when the bishop, who was not skilful in the English tongue, preached the Gospel, it was most delightful to see the king himself interpreting the Word of GOD to his commanders and ministers, for he had perfectly learned the language of the Scots during his long banishment. From that time many of the Scots came daily into Britain, and with great devotion preached the Word to those provinces of the English over which King Oswald reigned; and those among

them that had received priest's orders administered to them the grace of baptism. Churches were built in several places; the people joyfully flocked together to hear the Word; money and lands were given of the king's bounty to build monasteries; the English, great and small, were, by their Scottish masters, instructed in the rules and observance of regular discipline; for most of them that came to preach were monks. Bishop Aidan was himself a monk of the island called Hy [Iona], whose monastery was for a long time the chief of almost all those of the northern Scots, and all those of the Picts, and had the direction of their people. That island belongs to Britain, being divided from it by a small arm of the sea, but had been long since given by the Picts, who inhabit those parts of Britain, to the Scottish monks, because they had received the faith of CHRIST through their preaching."*

But Oswald reigned in Northumbria only nine years. It was sufficiently long, however, to consolidate the Church, and to give it that security which in such dangerous and barbarous times it needed. The piety and holiness both of King Oswald and Bishop Aidan is spoken of in the highest terms by Bede. They were not only exemplary in life, but conspicuous as the founders of schools and colleges of learning, which they introduced by means of the monks of Iona, from whom Aidan

* Bede's "Eccl. Hist." book iii. ch. 3.

himself had come. The good bishop died in the year 651, in the seventeenth year of his episcopate, and was buried at Lindisfarne. Finan succeeded in the bishopric, who was also of Scottish extraction, and from the same monastery of Hy or Iona. And again to Bishop Finan succeeded Colman from the same monastery. Thus the Scottish succession was maintained unmixed with the Roman, to the close of the seventh century.

But are we to speak of Northumbria as the only kingdom of the Heptarchy deriving its conversion and its Church from a native origin? By no means. By the holy lives and faithful zeal both of Oswald the King, and of Aidan the Bishop, and his successors, the Church of Christ advanced from Northumbria into Mercia, and even further down from Mercia into the kingdom of the East Saxons.

First as to Mercia. Containing as it did almost all the midland counties of England, that kingdom, as is evident from its place upon the map, must have been very powerful and populous; and yet up to this time, the middle of the seventh century, no attempt appears to have been made to evangelize it. Now, however, in the time of Oswy, who succeeded Oswald in Northumbria, the opening was made. A marriage was proposed between Penda, King of the Mercians, and Alchfled, daughter of Oswy. It was agreed that Penda, or Peada, should renounce his paganism. He did so, and was baptised by

Finan, second Bishop of Landisfarne. Upon this conversion being known, priests and bishops poured in from the North, of whom we principally hear the names of Cedda, Adda, Betti, and Diuma. Of these, Cedda, after labouring among the Mercians, was called away, and at the desire of the King of the East Saxons was made Bishop of London, and Diuma was consecrated a bishop under the title of Bishop of the Mid-English or Mercians,* afterwards Lichfield. Diuma with his three immediate successors in the bishopric were all of Scottish succession, deriving their orders from the same source as Aiden and Finan.

Secondly, as to the East Saxons. That kingdom contained within it the counties of Middlesex and Essex. A friendship arose between Oswy, King of Northumbria, and Sigibert the third King of the East Saxons. Under this influence Sigibert was won to the Christian faith, and was baptised by Finan, Bishop of Lindisfarne; and this king it was who received Ceada, or Cedd, from the King of Northumbria, and appointed him Bishop of London. This event is specially remarkable in bringing down the northern succession into the kingdom of the East Saxons; for Cedd received his consecration from Finan.

* Bede, iii. 21, 24.

So far then, the conversion of the Angles and Saxons in their several kingdoms of Northumbria and Mercia is very plain. And even in the other kingdoms it was by no means the case that the Roman party had the entire credit of their conversion; on the contrary, in many instances, the credit, as well as the influence and zeal of the northern party, was plainly prominent in the good work.

For instance. In East Anglia, although its people seem to have been in communion with Rome, still Bede tells us that even there, the conversion of the kingdom was mainly owing to the labours of Fursey, an Irish monk, who derived his orders from the North. The West Saxons were indeed chiefly converted by means of Birinus, a Roman monk, but even here his labours were forwarded greatly by Oswald, who married the daughter of Kynegils, king of that country. It will be very easy to perceive that the conversion of the people could not have been altogether independent of northern influence, when we learn that King Oswald stood sponsor at the baptism of his father-in-law.

Sussex was the last of the Saxon kingdoms which embraced the Gospel. These people were the slowest and most reluctant to abandon their idolatry, although, strange to say, if we look at the map they were nearest to the seat of that bishopric which sounded forth the highest claims to spiritual power. It was not till Ædil-

wach, King of Sussex, came back from the Mercian Court a Christian, baptised there with the King of Mercia for his sponsor, that his people embraced the faith. Then afterwards the Roman party came in and perfected the work.

Upon the whole, then, what are we to say of the common but absurd cry of the ignorant, that England owes its conversion to S. Augustine; that the Church among us is bound to the jurisdiction and authority of the Roman Pontiff; that had it not been for Pope Gregory and S. Augustine, we should not as a nation have received the light of the truth of JESUS CHRIST? What have we now seen as recognised and handed down to us by the historians of our country, and among others by the Venerable Bede, himself attached to the Roman party? What do we gather from these facts of history, of which there can be no doubt whatever, but that for one hundred years or nearly so after the arrival of S. Augustine, not a single county north of the Thames, except perhaps Norfolk and Suffolk, had received Christianity through the instrumentality of Rome; not a single kingdom but that of Kent was in any way under Roman jurisdiction in its transition from paganism to the Church of CHRIST. All the midland counties, from Edinburgh, embracing within it the present southern counties of Scotland, down to the great metropolis of the East, London—yes even London, our great

national pride as the head-quarters of our commerce, of our government, and of our wealth—all must attribute the blessings of their conversion from heathen idolatry to the labours of the Irish Scots; a Church altogether repudiating Roman interference, denying Roman jurisdiction, and upholding an Apostolical succession of bishops perfectly clear and distinct. So far from the truth is any claim of S. Augustine or his successors (up to the time of Honorius or Deusdedit the fifth Archbishop of Canterbury in the succession from him) to say that Rome in their persons were the converters of the Anglo-Saxons, that *beyond the single county of Kent*, they can point out no place where it is altogether the case. On the contrary, where certain beginnings had been made, as in the time of Paulinus in the Bishopric of York, and in the case of Mellitus in the Diocese of London, where they were by the unfortunate events of war or persecution driven out, they never seem to have had either the power or the energy to return. Unequal in strength, or deficient in zeal, they left the field open to the exertions of the native missionaries, and the ancient Churches of the land. Contending with violence about the distinction of Easter, and the shape of a tonsure, they were willing to sacrifice the faith of souls to the pride of an ecclesiastical precedence.

CHAPTER VIII.

It was not in the nature of things that a country, such as Great Britain was in the seventh century, divided by various contending parties in religion, should long remain free from the influence of that great central power, which at that time governed the world. The Bishopric of Rome, as it was the original seat of the apostolic power of the West, so it was the centre of all civilisation and dominion throughout the world. From Rome it was that the nations of Germany, the hordes of the North, the barbaric people of the Huns, Goths, Vandals, and every other tribe of heathenism, had already received, or were eventually to receive, the blessings of civilisation and of literature; and from Rome it was with various degrees of success that the whole continent of Europe had imbibed the first seeds of the great truths of salvation. But the land of Britain as it stood apart by its insular position, so it seemed for a long time to stand apart from that great dominion which absorbed the rest of the Western world. It boasted, as it has been seen in the preceding pages, to have received its Christianity from sources independent of Rome. Its liturgy, its ritual, its ceremonial usages, and its apostolical descent were traced in a clearly distinct and separate line from that of the continental nations. It rather referred its Church and its

conversion to the Apostle S. John in the East, than to S. Peter in the West; and for four centuries it had contended with heathenism and idolatry, with Romans and with Saxons, on its own independent merits. But now from the North in the Picts and Scots, as well as from the West in the original British bishops, the contest had to be waged with the same continental power which having subdued all else, was not likely to leave England the sole free country in the world. S. Augustine had made the first attempt in this direction. He failed. His bishopric, founded amid the heathen Saxons of Kent, for more than a century made but little advance. But the point of the wedge was there; it was adroitly placed; it required but time and skill to press it further home and eventually to gain the ascendant. Look to the North. There was the kingdom of Northumbria. Look to the midland counties. There was the kingdom of Mercia. Then look to the East Saxons, containing within them London itself. But all these were under the Northern or Scottish line of bishops. Then look to the West. There was the whole of Wales under its ancient episcopacy of the British Church. How did it come to pass then, that in spite of this apparent preponderance both of numbers and of space, the Bishopric of Canterbury, with its sole jurisdiction in Kent, should nevertheless prevail in the end over the whole, drive all before it, and become the ruling Church of the land?

It is to this point that we must now direct our minds. Bearing clearly in the memory the original independence of the British Churches, how was it that eventually they, together with every other national Church both of the Continent and of Great Britain, were for a time subjected to the all-prevailing dominion of Rome?

Oswald, King of Northumbria, was succeeded by his brother Oswy. Eanfleda, the daughter of Ethelburga, who had fled from Northumbria in the discomfiture of her husband Edwin, now returned to Northumbria as the wife of Oswy. But she, as well as her mother, having been brought up in the Kentish court, retained the Kentish usages, and could by no means be brought to conformity with those of Northumbria. The turning point of the difficulty was the custom of keeping Easter. This had ever been the battle-field of the Churches opposed to the Roman obedience. Though trivial in itself and to us of the present day hardly intelligible, yet to the Christians of the earlier ages it was a subject of important controversy. It was that upon which S. Augustine had insisted in his interview with the British bishops, and upon which he had failed in bringing them to any union with himself; because they rightly perceived that it was not so much the change of custom which he demanded, as that it was held to be a type and sign of submission to a foreign dominion. But the Court of Oswy now brought about, through a

mere domestic difficulty, that for which Popes and Bishops had so contended as an ecclesiastical rule.

It seems that from the beginning, the Asiatic Christians and those of the East had followed the teaching of S. John, and always celebrated their Paschal Feast, according to the Jewish rule, on the fourteenth day of the first month, whatever might be the day of the week on which it fell; whereas the rest of Christendom always kept their annual commemoration of the feast on a Sunday. These Asiatic Christians were therefore called Quartodecimans. This difference was at length set at rest by the Council of Nice in the year 325; and from that time all Christians throughout the world kept their Easter *on a Sunday*. Still, however, disputes were not by any means terminated; because, as the festival varied with the moon, the question remained as to *which of the Sundays* in the month it ought to fall on. Some Churches kept the feast of Easter as early as the fourteenth day of the month, *when that day fell on a Sunday;* while others deferred it in that case to the following Sunday, so that with them Easter might fall on the fifteenth, or twenty-first, or any other intermediate day. Among the former were the British and Scottish Churches. By their reckoning they never could have Easter later than the twentieth of the month, but might have it as early as the fourteenth. Among the latter were the Roman Churches, who decided

that Easter ought never to be celebrated on an earlier day than the fifteenth of the month. Hence there was a perpetual jar and discord among Christians at the very time that love and peace ought most to possess their hearts. It frequently happened that in the Court of Oswy, the king, with his Northumbrian party, would be celebrating Easter with its glad festivities on the very day that his Queen Eanfleda, with her Kentish or Roman party, would be engaged in the austerities of Lent. The Palm Sunday of one might be the Easter Day of the other.

It was this absurdity, as well as inconvenience, that after some time moved the king to call a conference of the two Churches, which should finally determine the vexed question. Colman was now Bishop of the northern division of England. To him, with his clergy, accompanied by Hilda, abbess of the monastery of Whitby, was confided the defence of the Scottish use; while on the other side of the controversy appeared Alcfrid, son of Oswy, who had been brought up in the Roman use, together with his mother Eanfleda, Agilbert, Bishop of the West Saxons, and Wilfrid, afterwards Bishop of York. It is needless here to relate with any degree of particularity the arguments which were brought forward upon either side. They are fully related by the historian Bede. Sufficient for our present purpose, is to know that King Oswy determined in favour of the Kentish use; that in

consequence of this determination Bishop Colman seceded from his diocese of Lindisfarne, and returned to the monastery of Iona, and afterwards to Ireland; while on all sides, from the notoriety of this decision, and from the submission which was involved in it to the See of Canterbury, the Roman party acquired greater strength and influence throughout the country than they had at any time hitherto possessed. From this period none but the Welsh or British adhered any longer to their old manner of keeping Easter, and even they about the year 800 gave way at the persuasion of Elbodius their bishop, and thus the Easter controversy was finally determined.

Shortly after the synod or conference at Whitby, Deusdedit, fifth Bishop of Canterbury, departed this life, and thus another opening was made for a further progress in the policy of the Roman Church. Oswy having so far succeeded in the junction of the two Churches, entered into a compact with Egbert, King of Kent, for the appointment of an Archbishop of such attainments and character as would be likely to bring the whole of England into one conformity of faith. It was evident that the bitterness of religious division which pervaded the nation would never cease so long as the factious spirit of the two Churches was kept alive; so long as one party refused consecration at the hands of the other; so long as Roman would hold no communion with British or British with Roman; but each in turn re-

pelled and cast out the other, as circumstances and opportunity gave them the upper hand. To obviate this, was manifestly the interest of all. The two kings having agreed upon a succession in the See of Canterbury, chose one Wighart, by birth a Saxon, and educated in the Roman usage in the Church of Kent. It was agreed that he should betake himself to Rome, and receive his consecration at the hands of the Pope. In pursuance of this plan Wighart made his journey to Rome, but just when all things were ready for his consecration the plague broke out and the new archbishop was carried off among the first of its victims. The Pope (Vitalian) was not slow in making use of the opportunity of advancing his interests which this event thus singularly set before him. Since the time of S. Augustine, the original missionary from Rome, no archbishop had been directly named from the See of S. Peter. Much as the Roman party had desired it, the Saxon kings, as well as the clergy themselves, had always so contrived as to keep the see within their own hands. But now, as the nominee of the Saxon kings had so unexpectedly been removed, and it was evident that such an archbishop was desired as would throw the weight of his character into the scale of the Roman party, Pope Vitalian recommended one Theodore, a Greek by nation, but a man of the greatest learning and ability. He was consecrated to the see in the year 668, and arrived in England as the sixth archbishop

of Canterbury the next year. Everything seemed to promise well for the union of the Churches under his vigorous administration, but many difficulties still remained. As yet, although the See of Canterbury was acknowledged by all the Roman party, still in reality it never had any legitimate jurisdiction beyond the Kingdom of Kent. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, although himself consecrated on the Roman side, yet repeatedly refused the authority of Theodore; and the principal part of Theodore's episcopacy was occupied in continual contests with the rival Archbishop of York. But Theodore in the end prevailed. All irregularities in the order of the Church he rectified. When he found any bishops of doubtful consecration, or when he thought he might increase or consolidate his power by reconsecration, there he managed either by persuasion or by force to bring it about. Thus for instance S. Chad, who was placed in the See of York during the absence of Wilfrid, was by his inducement transferred to Lichfield, and being found to have received his consecration from Wini, Bishop of Winchester, of Gallican orders, and two British bishops of the ancient succession, Theodore induced him to submit to the laying on of hands again. This was the famous S. Chad of Lichfield, brother to Ceadda, Bishop of the East Saxons, of whom we spoke in the last chapter. Theodore was also most active in the establishment of schools of every kind of learning, founding

them not only in his own especial diocese, but also throughout the whole island; and thus by degrees so establishing his authority, that at length he came to be considered the Metropolitan of all England. Thus it is described by Bede:—

"He visited all the island, wherein the tribes of the Angles inhabited, for he was willingly entertained, and heard by all persons . . . . . He was the first archbishop whom all the English Church obeyed. Everywhere attended and assisted by Hadrian, he taught the right rule of life, and the canonical custom of celebrating Easter; and forasmuch as both of them were well read both in sacred and in secular literature they gathered a crowd of disciples, and there daily flowed from them rivers of knowledge to water the hearts of their hearers; and together with the books of holy writ, they also taught them the arts of ecclesiastical poetry, astronomy, and arithmetic. . . . . Never were there happier times since the English came into Britain; for their kings being brave men and good Christians, they were a terror to all barbarous nations, and the minds of all men were bent upon the joys of the Heavenly Kingdom of which they had just heard, and all who desired to be instructed in the sacred reading had masters at hand to teach them."*

Theodore was also the first archbishop who convened the clergy in any sort of council, first

* Bede, "Eccles. Hist.," book iv. ch. 2.

at Hertford, and afterwards at Hatfield. At the former of these, the Bishops of East Anglia, Rochester, Wessex, and Mercia, were all personally present, and Wilfrid, the Northumbrian prelate, not able to be present in person, sent two representatives. At this council canons were passed, and all the usual forms of a national Church synod were observed. This was the first instance of any kind of convention of the clergy in Great Britain for the regulation of a common Church. At the latter, namely, at Hatfield, the great heresy of the Monothelites was considered. Honorius, Bishop of Rome, had unfortunately attached himself to this heretical party; and a council had been convened at Constantinople in the year 680, to condemn this heresy, and to set forth the duty of the Church.

Theodore, from his perfect knowledge of the usages of the Church, followed up this great council, by applying it as metropolitan to his own immediate circumstances. Imitating the ancient models, he convened the bishops and clergy, recited publicly the decrees and canons of the first four General Councils; that of Nice against the Arians, the first of Constantinople against the Macedonians, that of Ephesus against the Nestorians, and that of Chalcedon against Eutyches. Then adding the minor councils, and more especially that in which the Monothelites, *with Pope Honorius*, had been condemned, he obtained the willing assent of all present. He then

pronounced the faith of the English Church, thus grounded on the four General Councils, and placed it on a foundation hitherto unsettled and undefined, but now taking its acknowledged place as a portion of the Universal Church.

Now, from all these circumstances, as they are thus historically unfolded, we infer that this must be the date at which we are to place* the first absorption, if not of the British, certainly of the Scottish Churches into that of Rome. We observe first, the co-operation of the royal power with the Kentish Church, and the cessation of the controversy about Easter and other ecclesiastical customs. We observe secondly, the agreement of the Saxon kings in the reception of Theodore as their archbishop. We trace his recognised authority in regulating the affairs of the Church, in deposing bishops, reconsecrating them, and visiting the different dioceses; not confined, as all his predecessors had been, to the mere kingdom of Kent, but universally through the land. We find him assembling national councils, at which even

* Strictly speaking, the British Church continued some time longer as an independent Church, but this also was compelled at last to submit to the all-absorbing power. The first breach in the succession of the Welsh Church was in the time of S. Dunstan, Archbishop of Canterbury, A.D. 982; and finally in the twelfth century, Wales being reduced to a province of England by Henry I., Bernard, a Norman, was appointed Bishop of S. David's, and made a suffragan of Canterbury. From that date the Welsh Church was but one with the Roman.

Wilfrid, his great rival, as Archbishop of York, assisted by his representatives. We find him moreover establishing schools of learning, harmonizing the various points of discrepancy in religious usages which had hitherto existed among the people, and, in short, establishing throughout the land peace, uniformity, and concord. We infer then, as all historians agree in affirming, that this is the precise period in the history of England at which we must date the cessation of the ancient independent spirit of the several scattered Churches.

From Theodore to S. Dunstan, during the highest power of the Saxon kings, and from S. Dunstan to Lanfranc, the Primate of England in the time of the first Norman Conqueror, history has but little more to do than record the gradual subjection of the English Church under the one universal dominion of the Papacy. Politics were interwoven with religion. It served the turn of princes to obtain from the Bishop of Rome a recognition of their power, and of their crowns; it served the turn of the Bishop of Rome to obtain, as a recompense for his spiritual acknowledgment of them, the subjugation of their people and of their Churches to the jurisdiction of the apostolic see. It was a sale and bargain between the two. And thus the middle ages grew on. Contests there were for a time, as in the case of Henry II. and S. Thomas à Becket; but those contests invariably terminated in the cords being closer and

closer drawn around even the political power of the nation, much more the spiritual power of the Church. The history of the Anglo-Saxon Church, therefore, as such, ceases and determines with Archbishop Theodore. It is absorbed, both as to doctrine and as to discipline, in Rome, and does not revive again until the great era of the Reformation in the reign of Henry VIII.

But what took place in that great interval? What changes were brought about? What additions to the Catholic faith? What perversions of true doctrine?

It was no detriment to the English Church that she should suffer the absorption of herself, as a national Church, into the great universal stream of Catholicity, represented and embodied by the Bishop of Rome as Patriarch of the West; it was no detriment to her vitality, to her identity with her past independence, or to her truthfulness; because, *at that time*, there were no doctrines peculiar to Rome as over and above those of the Catholic faith. The corruption, of which we shall have to speak, grew up *subsequently to the time of Archbishop Theodore*. Therefore her absorption into Rome was justified; nay, more than justified, it was a great act of Christian and confiding love; it was a sign of her true and inherent catholicity, based, as we have seen it, on the four General Councils, recited by Theodore at Hatfield, and embraced by all her bishops without dissent or disparagement.

But that which she so readily gave up in times when Rome was untainted by unauthorised additions to those four General Councils, she had the right to recal when those unauthorised additions compromised the great truths of Christianity. Let it be granted that in the Anglo-Saxon Church, as soon as its ancient independence had disappeared, there came a junction and incorporation with Rome; that junction and incorporation contained in itself, *and at the time it was made*, nothing whatever to complain of. It only became a matter of complaint when it was exercised in opposition to the canons of the Universal Church, and enforced matters of doctrine and discipline which the ancient Church either did not know or rejected.

It may be easily shown, however, that even in Theodore's time, any recognition of the supremacy of Rome in the sense it was afterwards claimed, was utterly unknown. Wilfrid, Archbishop of York, deprived of his bishopric, appealed to Rome. Rome decided in his favour, and yet Wilfrid was not at that time restored to his see; on the contrary, he was thrust into prison; and the Church of England proceeded on her own authority to regulate and decree what was due to justice, of her own inherent power, totally irrespective of Rome. And Theodore himself of Asiatic origin, and of Eastern temperament, was by no means disposed to recognise any interference in his government, where it was

contrary to the canons of the Universal Church ; but, as in the national councils which he called at Hertford and at Hatfield, he exercised an independent authority as an independent prelate. He maintained his position, as many of his successors did from time to time subsequently, resting his jurisdiction on the ancient canons of the Church and universal custom.

Here then we take leave of the ancient British and Scottish Churches as matters of history. Our inquiry must now turn upon those great matters of doctrine which rendered it so unhappily necessary in after times to revive their liberties and re-assert their ancient privileges. How the great truths of the Faith became gradually compromised from the time of Theodore to the time of the Council of Trent ; and how the purity of the ancient doctrines was gradually corrupted and overlaid, so that it became the bounden duty of the English Church to return to the "old paths," from which she had, under the guidance of Rome, diverged ; it will be our next business to inquire. We must pursue this inquiry, not in the bitter spirit of partizans, but in the soberness and love of true Catholics. We must not forget the many inestimable blessings, the rich and bountiful inheritance which, in many points, Rome has handed down to us, rightly preserved and faithfully guarded ; but we must, at the same time, grieve

that, with this preservation of our inheritance, she has coupled such fearful aberrations and such unjust demands, that our independence of her jurisdiction, and the re-assertion of our ancient privileges became, for the sake of truth, a matter of sorrowful but inevitable necessity.

CHAPTER IX.

Decay, gradual deterioration, and ultimate loss of its original essence and spirit is the sure work of every institution in which man has a part. In the political things of kingdoms we see this truth plainly enough. Changes of dynasty, revolutions, wars, reforms, mark, in the history of every people, the great fact that men cannot be combined together long in any community without the necessity of change; that change depending on the growth of abuse, of injustice, and of wrong, which seems inherent in their nature. Nor is it otherwise in those institutions which have their origin even in a Divine source, that is to say, even in religion and the Church: for we must remember not only Him *from Whom*, but those *to whom* any Divine revelation is imparted. We must reflect that although it be ever so true that the Church is of God, yet it is also true that human beings receiving and becoming that Church, immediately bring into it their own imperfections, and their own sins; and that there-

fore the Church is no more exempt from decay, deterioration, and loss of its original essence and spirit, than any other institution.

Such is the fact notoriously put before us in the history of the Old Testament; for, if to any people on the face of the earth, surely it was to the Jews that Almighty God revealed Himself in the fulness of His power. He is there depicted as in chosen men of His own direct appointment, their Law-giver, their Judge, and their King; His will is imparted to them in a manner which no one could mistake, and accompanied with promises of glory which would kindle the dullest, and awaken to righteousness the most obstinate heart; and yet what do we there perceive? History passes along the course of centuries, and behold, all their religious knowledge of God is nationally debased and perverted. Traditions of men come into the place of the Divine laws which were originally made the basis of truth, and the intention of the Almighty is so utterly frustrated, that He Himself becomes Incarnate in order to save the world from utter destruction. We know in what terms of indignation our blessed Saviour speaks of those to whom He came; how He sets forth their many perversions of God's will; their loss of the Divine Spirit which was once imparted to them as a chosen people; and the necessity therefore in Himself, as a new Lawgiver and a new Revealer of Truth, to regain what was lost. The Spirit

of God once manifest in Moses and the prophets had, as it were, died out. Lapse of time, and the imperfections of a carnal nature had obliterated it; and now Jesus Christ came to renovate and to restore.

Analogy will carry us on by the same universal law of imperfection, even to that new revelation which Jesus Christ thus imparted Himself. For still it was to poor human creatures that He spake; still it was to the same nature, and, though with special promise of regeneration which the Jews knew not, nevertheless liable to fall, that He revealed Himself. And although to chosen apostles, and men stamped with the miraculous power of the Holy Ghost, nevertheless it was to men, not made either infallible or impeccable, that He gave His Divine word, and upon whom He built His Universal Church. At first, while the bright halo of His very Person incarnate remained in the memory of His disciples, and while the Church still breathed the very breath of His personal care and love, there was purity and holiness, unity and peace; but just in proportion to the lapse of generations, as the memory of His Person faded away, and the record of the first gifts of Pentecost became fainter and fainter; so did the original exaltation of the Christian disciple above the world cease; and with a more uncertain faith, there came a less Divine impulse to turn to God in the fulness of His teaching.

Precisely as the Jewish religion deteriorated as time advanced, until the advent of JESUS CHRIST aroused the world to a reformation; so did that very reformation which He Himself announced deteriorate after His departure, fall away, and become perverted; until we see it, as it now is, if not in too many instances the creature, at least the friend of the world, of politics and of kingly craft. At first we read of the Church "going from house to house, and eating meat with gladness and singleness of heart;" of "continuing stedfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," and of "having all things common," "being of one heart and soul, neither saying any of them that aught of the things which he possessed was his own." We read of the disciples as being men of the strictest self-denial and austerity, and although, with the exception of S. Paul, men of the poorest, as well as the most illiterate character, still of the most determined and unflinching resistance to the world. Some, indeed, as James and John in their earlier history, had set forth a spirit of worldly ambition; but rebuked for this in the teaching of their Divine Master, they became a special warning for ever to such spirits as might be inclined to imitate them. We read of the fiery enthusiasm of the Boanerges, who thought to propagate their discipleship by the violence of human power, and to "call down fire from heaven" to consume those who opposed them;

but they were told that they knew not of what spirit they were, and that the discipleship of CHRIST was one of love, not force. And so ever after the Day of Pentecost we find this love prevailing. Discipline indeed of punishment there was when great sinners stood forth in hypocrisy, as in the case of Simon Magus, and that of the incestuous Corinthian; but with these rare exceptions the propagation of the Faith was made in the spirit which our LORD Himself had taught; and while "to the poor the gospel was preached," the world as such, its riches, its dominion, and its glory, made no part of Christianity.

But this did not last. For a long time indeed the philosophers of the world, and the kings and princes of the nations, would have nothing to say to this revelation of CHRIST. They merely mocked and derided it as a thing of evanescent enthusiasm. They aroused themselves at times to use it as a blind for some iniquitous persecution, or to relieve a political distemper, as in the reigns of Nero and Domitian; but generally the Christians of the first ages were of the poor, the illiterate, and the unobserved. They spent their time in devotion, led a sequestered life, gave themselves to the strictest chastity, and abandoned the world, according to the Apostle's teaching—"Love not the world, neither the things of the world."

But soon that "world" which Christianity had denounced came in to taste the sweetness

of the heavenly banquet, which it saw afar off, but knew not, and indeed could never know. The rich and great among men came in, and, like the harpies of the poet, polluted what they could not enjoy. First, the "world" came in under the guise of philosophy, and to the pure simple doctrines of the blessed SAVIOUR imparted a gloss of human knowledge. From the Greek and Asiatic schools there came indeed many who received the gifts of the Spirit in humility, and cast aside their human learning for that of GOD. Justin Martyr was a scholar of Aristotle and Pythagoras, and he became a Christian, a true and faithful witness for his LORD. Clemens of Alexandria was a man of conspicuous learning; so also Tertullian; so again Origen, and Lactantius, and Eusebius. These however were but exceptions. The inroad of philosophy was too generally the inroad of heresy, and the first great name of division which polluted the virgin purity of the Church was that of the Gnostics. They were the most polished as well as the most learned of the Christian name, and that general designation, meaning by its very word "*knowledge*," contained within it an infinite number of sects, all of which, more or less, boasted of their bishops and doctors, who either forged spurious gospels to suit their own tenets, or perverted by their own peculiar glosses those that the Church put forth as containing the deposit of faith.

Eusebius describes the followers of one of these

philosophers, Artemon, and he complains how in them, instead of that former purity and simplicity of faith which the apostles had taught, they were undermining the faith by their measurement of it upon principles of human reason.

"They presume to alter the Holy Scriptures, to abandon the ancient rule of faith, and to form their opinions according to the subtle precepts of logic. The science of the Church is neglected for the study of geometry, and they lose sight of heaven while they are employed in measuring the earth. Euclid is perpetually in their hands. Aristotle and Theophrastus are the objects of their admiration, and they express an uncommon reverence for the works of Galen. Their errors are derived from the abuse of the arts and sciences of the infidels, and *they corrupt the simplicity of the Gospel by the refinements of human reason.*"*

And just in proportion as, on the one hand, the inroads of the world's philosophy brought heresy into the Church, and filled, as from age to age we know it did, the chief cities of Asia and Greece with pestilential disputes on the subject of the Faith; so, on the other hand, did the inroad of the great and rich men of the earth, of kings and princes, very soon after pollute, if not destroy, the pure fountains of her integrity and her holiness. Pliny the younger, Proconsul of Bithynia, was directed by the Emperor Trajan to

* Eusebius, v. 28.

inquire into the circumstances of a sect called Christians; and in his letter of reply he states that men were to be found among them of "*every order.*" Tertullian, in defending the Christians of Africa, assures the Proconsul that if he continues to persecute the Christians, he will decimate Carthage, and that he will find citizens of the highest rank among them. The Emperor Valerian in his rescripts in the middle of the third century, evidently supposes that Roman knights and ladies of eminence secretly swelled the numbers of the Christian sect; and there is little doubt but that in the reign of Domitian, the palace, the courts of justice, and the army concealed within them a multitude of the most eminent of the Roman people, who, though not daring openly, yet in reality professed to embrace the faith of CHRIST. And thus the Church advanced. It was gratifying indeed in one sense to perceive the steady and sure progress of the great cause committed to her hands. The increasing extent of her number, as souls were gathered into the fold, might, at first sight, form a ground of gratification at which it would be hard for any to take exception. But the question is, whether in the too indiscriminate character of the converts who came in from the higher ranks, there did not in reality lie the seed of her future difficulties and corruptions; whether in this very appearance of success, the Church was not beginning to lose the high character of her intrinsic purity.

As long indeed as it was a disgrace and a danger for the rich to profess Christianity, we may naturally suppose that the very danger was a security to the Church; and that a secrecy of profession was a safeguard against any very great degree of relaxation of morals. But the third century of the Christian era drew to its close, and it is quite clear that by that time some very great change had come over the whole appearance and character of the Church. Purified as she had so often been by the blood of persecution, and testified by the cries of martyrs, she had now emerged into the light of the broad day; and without entering into any particulars of detail, the simple fact that the Emperor Constantine thought, or acted as though he thought, that it was a sign of political wisdom to become a Christian, amply explains how the truths of the Gospel were no longer confined to the poor and lowly. However true it might have been in the first outset of the Church, that "not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble were called," but "the foolish things were called to confound the wise," still it is perfectly clear that this character of the Christian dispensation was very soon entirely changed. Sad, but too true, is the account which the historian Gibbon relates of the conversion of Constantine, as depicting the lowered tone of spirituality in which the Christian faith then dealt with the world. Sad that the worldliness of the Church should

thus testify against herself, and compel us to allow the truth of the infidel's sneer against the deeper mysteries of our most holy Faith.

"The bishops and teachers of the new sect (Christians), whose dress and manners had not qualified them for the residence of a court, were admitted to the imperial table. They accompanied the monarch in his expeditions, and the ascendant which one of them, an Egyptian or a Spaniard, acquired over his mind, was imputed by the pagans to the effect of magic. Lactantius, who has adorned the precepts of the Gospel with the eloquence of Cicero, and Eusebius, who has consecrated the learning and philosophy of the Greeks to the service of religion, were both received into the friendship and familiarity of their sovereign: and those able masters of controversy could partially watch the soft and yielding moments of persuasion, and dexterously apply the arguments which were best adapted to his character and understanding. Whatever advantages might be derived from the acquisition of an imperial proselyte, he was distinguished by the splendour of his purple, rather than by the superiority of wisdom or virtue, from the many thousands of his subjects who had embraced the doctrines of Christianity."

Then he describes the courteous flattery and anxious impatience with which the Church watched the advance of the great convert to her faith, not perceiving how ultimately the very

success would recoil against her. The imitation of her Lord in having no respect for persons was surely lost among Christians, if anything like the following account be true.

"The awful mysteries of the Christian faith and worship were concealed from the eyes of strangers, and even of catechumens, with an affected secrecy which served to excite their wonder and their curiosity. But the severe rules of discipline which the prudence of bishops had established, were relaxed by the same prudence in favour of an imperial proselyte, whom it was so important to allure by every gentle condescension into the pale of the Church, and Constantine was permitted, at least by a tacit dispensation, to enjoy most of the privileges before he had contracted any of the obligations of a Christian."

Yes; and this courting of the great and of the world advances still further into what we may almost call a desecration of the holiest things of God. A Christian Emperor, so the Church in her already weakened purity then thought, must be obtained at all hazards, and at all hazards she did obtain him. At that time it was too much the custom, in her effort to win rich converts, to permit, with outward professions of faith, a delay of Baptism even till the last hour. Unlike the conversion of the eunuch, who, seeing the water, cried out with the unsuspecting sincerity of faith, "What doth hinder me from being baptised?" or that of the jailor, who in the alarm of his awakened

conscience, exclaimed, "What shall I do to be saved?" and so "he and his household were baptised *straightway*;" it would appear that the Church in the beginning of the fourth century could permit the anticipated baptism of the great, as possible to co-exist with sin. The gifts of the HOLY GHOST might be delayed or hastened at individual discretion. So our historian, again with a sneer at a melancholy truth, continues :—

"Among the proselytes of Christianity there were many who judged it imprudent to precipitate a salutary rite, which could not be repeated, or to throw away an inestimable privilege, which could never be recovered. By the delay of their baptism, they could venture freely to indulge their passions in the enjoyments of the world, while they still retained in their own hands the means of a sure and easy absolution. The sublime theory of the Gospel had made a much fainter impression on the heart than on the understanding of Constantine. He pursued the great object of his ambition through the dark and bloody paths of war and policy; and after the victory he abandoned himself without moderation to the abuse of his fortune. Instead of asserting his just superiority above the imperfect heroism and profane philosophy of Trajan and the Antonines, the mature age of Constantine forfeited the reputation which he had acquired in his youth. As he gradually advanced in the knowledge of truth, he proportionally declined in

the practice of virtue, and the same year of his reign in which he convened the Council of Nice was polluted by the execution, or rather the murder, of his eldest son. . . . . Future tyrants were encouraged to believe that the innocent blood which they might shed in a long reign would instantly be washed away in the waters of regeneration, and the abuse of religion dangerously undermined the foundation of moral virtue."*

This case is cited as one great leading proof of the fall and degradation of the Church in the fourth century. Boasted of by the thoughtless and held up by the profane as the golden era of Christianity, when first she subdued the world of the great, and achieved the conversion of the kings and rulers of the earth; it is cited here to show how, on the contrary, in the general course of the fall of all things from their original purity, the Church makes no exception. Gradually filled with the philosophy of the Gentiles and the wisdom of science falsely so called, on the one hand; heresies and divisions, discord and confusion, inevitably follow. On the other hand, attracted by the glare of worldly power, and a desire of participation in the glories of that world which by her very origin she was bound to fear and to abjure; she is filled indeed with the outward glory which she coveted, and kings and princes become her

* Gibbon, ch. xx.

nursing fathers and nursing mothers, but in the act of doing so she is polluted as with pitch. She has never from that moment recovered the pure and unsullied holiness of the Apostles of Galilee or the preaching of Pentecost. From the conversion or supposed conversion of Constantine, she becomes a creature of that world against which she was sent forth to testify. She still indeed existed, and does exist; she still was, and continues to be, "leaven to leaven the whole lump," as her LORD had taught; but not as she was. Weakened, marred, and stained, she falls into that general aspect of decay which the universal analogy of human things teaches us to prepare for and expect. From the date of Constantine springs up the unjust and unhallowed idea of the junction or incorporation of the spiritual power with the temporal. From that date springs up the absorption of the great and of the rich into the Church in a nominal acquiescence in her privileges coupled with a tacit refusal to acknowledge the higher obligations of the Christian covenant. From that date springs up the grievous sight of kings and princes, warriors and statesmen, laying hold of the spiritual offices of the Church, and filling them, as their needs require, with creatures of their own; prostituting the holiness of the priesthood to subserve the political interests of their day. And last of all, more grievous still, springs up that perpetual contest which stains the pages of history, of priest against priest, and

bishop against bishop; each striving to trample on the other. No longer looking to the interests of that great LORD and GOD whose disciples they assert themselves to be; no longer valuing the souls of men, to save whom they profess to believe that great LORD and GOD died upon the Cross; they seem to live but for the pushing forward of secular interests, the obtaining of high places among men, and to be called of the world "Rabbi, Rabbi."

Thus then the Church declined; declined in the purity of her doctrine; declined in the high tone of her spirituality, and became that which her Divine Founder had warned her never to be—*of the world, worldly.*

There is another feature of her decline which of necessity accompanied the two former; indeed running parallel with them, it completes the whole scene of her deterioration. This third feature is her *government.* How her government in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters varied from the Apostolical institutions, and took by degrees that form which issued at length in what is now called *Papal Supremacy,* will form our next consideration. The reader will carefully observe how the one follows the other. The world entering into the Church, and still remaining the world, instead of the Church keeping aloof and distinct from the world, is the keystone of that great arch on which Satan at the present moment takes his stand, and defies the Living GOD.

CHAPTER X.

The first Christians being joined together in one common brotherhood, and looking to each other for sympathy and fellowship, had need to resort, as all other brotherhoods, to some form of government by which their general interests might be maintained. Had any particular form of government been expressly dictated by the precepts of our blessed Lord, or been found in the inspiration of Holy Scripture, the miserable controversies which have since divided the Church had never arisen. Some leading principles do seem indeed to be laid down, such as the appointment of the three sacred orders of bishops, priests, and deacons, and the determination of all controverted points by a council or synod of the Church. And, as far as the assemblies of the faithful are concerned in matters of worship, rules for order and discipline may be easily traced both in the Acts of the Apostles and in the Epistles of S. Paul. But nowhere do they embrace that wider field of government which was needed to be arranged in anticipation of the time when the Church should put forth her branches in her dominion "throughout all the world."

The Twelve Apostles stand forth conspicuous in our Lord's teaching as the rulers of the Church. The seventy elders appear as in some degree endued with authority, but they seem merged after a

time in other offices, and are confined in their ministrations to the Jews. They do not appear with that distinctness of order or appointment which adheres to the Apostles in their mission to the Gentiles; while again the seven deacons stand forth as mere ministers or assistants to the Apostles in the inferior ministrations of the Church. The apostolic eleven, replenished by the accession of S. Matthias, S. Paul, and S. Barnabas, accompanied by their deacons, and in some cases by evangelists and prophets, carry on the ministrations of the Church throughout the whole of the Acts of the Apostles, which embraces the period of the first century. When the Church met together as a body for mutual counsel or direction, it was under them as their heads and rulers that they met; witness the first council at Jerusalem on the question of circumcision. And whenever disputes arose in any of the cities or places where an assembly of the faithful was gathered together, it was to the supervision and authority of some one of the Apostles that those disputes were referred; witness the case of the Corinthian Church under S. Paul. And in general we may say that the authoritative tone in which the Epistles are written to the several Churches throughout the world, as those by S. Peter, S. James, S. John, and S. Jude, are proofs of a consciousness within the minds of the writers that they were endued with and that they were exercising the powers of rulers.

Hence then we have very little difficulty, as far as Holy Scripture is concerned, in collecting both affirmatively and negatively what the will of our blessed LORD was as to Church government. Affirmatively it was, that holy men of apostolic ordination, inspired immediately from on high, and who therefore could not err, should direct the body, and the whole body paying implicit deference to the source of that authority, should be moulded and shaped into discipline by their wisdom, their holiness, and their judgment. Negatively it was that no one particular person, no one particular form of hierarchy, no attempt at any monarchical display of power, or subjugation of one part to the other, should form the government of His Church. This, in His all-embracing mercy, He left to the management of those that were to come after, as is very clearly manifested by His abstaining from any specific command concerning it.

But the apostolic age passed away. The last of those who had received any special inspiration departed to his LORD, and the beloved disciple S. John witnessed in his own person the extinction of the apostolic name early in the second century. What course then had the Church to pursue when this took place? If the great promise were true, that the Divine Founder of the Church should ever be with her, "even to the end of the world," it followed that in some way, now that the apostles had departed, this promise should be made manifest. This came to pass; for S. Paul

had provided successors to himself in Crete and Ephesus, to whom, during life, he had committed his own apostolic office, short only of the special and miraculous gifts by which he had himself been distinguished. In Jerusalem S. James was appointed bishop, and successors after him. At Antioch, where S. Peter had first presided as bishop, similar successors were fixed. It was the same at Rome, where S. Peter and S. Paul had jointly founded a Church, and together had suffered martyrdom. At Alexandria, too, it is said S. Mark had founded a Church, and had conveyed from the apostles a succession of holy men to preside over the Christians of that city.

Of all these special apostolic acts we know for certain, because they are mentioned either in Holy Scripture, or in early writings of the fathers, and no doubt can be entertained of them as matters of fact. The name by which these holy men were at first designated was "Angels," and sometimes "Apostles." Generally, however, they took the name of bishops or overseers, and were considered, as in fact they were, *successors* of the Apostles. Each one had the regulation of the affairs of the Church among the people over whom he was fixed, with presbyters or priests, and deacons under him, and knew no other superior than his Divine Lord.

"Let none, however," says Mosheim, "confound the bishops of this primitive and golden period of the Church with those of whom we read

in the following ages; for though they were both distinguished by the same name, yet they differed in many respects. A bishop during the first and second century was a person who had the care of one Christian assembly, which, at that time, was, generally speaking, small enough to be contained in a private house. . . . . He instructed the people, performed the several parts of divine worship, attended the sick, and inspected the circumstances and supplies of the poor. He charged indeed the presbyters with the performance of those duties and services which the multiplicity of his engagements rendered it impossible for him to fulfil, but he had not the power to decide or enact anything without the consent of the presbyters and people; and though the episcopal office was laborious, and singularly dangerous, yet its revenues were extremely small, since the Church had no certain income, but depended on the gifts or oblations of the multitude, which were no doubt inconsiderable, and were moreover to be divided among the bishops, presbyters, deacons, and the poor."*

Here then we perceive the first seeds of the government of the Church. A chief ruler or overseer presiding over all, both clergy and laity, fulfilling the place of an apostle, but called a bishop. The transmission of authority is from our LORD Himself, but it comes through the hands and by the ordination of an Apostle. Each

* Mosheim, book i. part ii. cap. 2.

Apostle conveys in different parts of the world, and in different Churches, the same Divine gift, but all form one body: THE CHURCH.

But this first seed of Church government was rapidly extended and developed in proportion as the disciples grew in number. It was extended on both sides; for first, when the inferior towns and smaller villages began to embrace Christianity, it was needful that over them should be placed a guide and superintendent, similar to him who presided in the larger cities. The *Chor-Episcopus*, or country bishop, took this place, and thus there arose a large class of subsidiary or suffragan bishops, who were still attached to the chief bishop of the main city. While, however, this multiplication of a lower rank of bishops took place on one side, there was arising a proportionate increase of the higher rank on the other side; and as new cities grew into power, or became seats of government in the civil matters of the Roman State, so the higher rank of bishops became more numerous; for in those early ages it was never thought possible that *any city*, where assemblies of Christians were gathered together, should be without its bishop. It was not as now, when the visit of a bishop to many a country town or village is a mere triennial matter if even that. The idea of the Church in those days was, that the episcopal office, as well as the priestly, should *daily* be seen at work, and *constantly*, and in *every place alike*.

But, from this increase of the number of the chief bishops, it soon became necessary to make a further distinction. Some cities in a province were of more importance than others; some bishops were men of greater eminence than others; some of greater skill and power in the management of business; so that for the sake of order, one of the chief cities in a province gave the title of *Primate* or *Metropolitan* to its bishop, and by degrees certain privileges became attached to that particular bishop, as the chief head or ruler over and above all others in the province. The boundaries of the province were mostly regulated by the civil enactments of the Roman Empire, and changed from time to time with them. Episcopal provinces therefore were more or less numerous, or extended in size, as the history of the Roman Empire varied in its fortunes. But in all cases the authority of each metropolitan stood clear and independent of every other metropolitan, and to him was confided the whole management of his provincial Church, subject of course to the canons and rules agreed upon by universal consent. Synods were held, in which disputes, either of doctrine or of law, were determined by the metropolitan, who sat in council taking advice with the bishops of his province. In this council or synod questions of doctrine were determined, schisms healed, and unruly or immoral members of the Church censured or expelled. To the metropolitan was confided the

duty of ordaining all his suffragan bishops; not however that he was to choose or appoint them himself, but when elected by the majority of the votes of the synod, it was the sole privilege of the metropolitan to ordain, or consecrate him within his own province. On the other hand, he himself was chosen and consecrated by the majority of his own suffragan bishops. They elected him from among themselves, with the concurrence of the people. They consecrated him from among themselves, and on no occasion, according to the canons, was it lawful either for them or for him to go out of their own province for any spiritual purpose.

It is very important that the reader should keep in mind these few primary principles of Church government. *No metropolitan could interfere with the province of another.* There was no going out of one province to consecrate, ordain, or take part in any possible way in the affairs of the Church of another. Each in itself contained a perfect organisation, handed down from the Apostles for the purpose of teaching, ruling, and perpetuating the succession of the ministry.

Let us look upon the map, and observe how the Church was now advancing in the third century. One of the principal of these metropolitan seats was *Alexandria*, which was the head of all the Churches of Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis. Another, *Carthage*, which was the head of all the African Churches. The Church of *Lyons*, in

France, was another metropolitan seat, presiding over the neighbouring Churches of Gaul ; while *Ephesus* ruled those of Asia. *Rome* also, as the chief city of Italy, was the seat of a metropolitan, but its extent was not very great ; for we find the ancient city of *Milan* forming a metropolitan Church, with jurisdiction perfectly distinct, and independent of Rome, as also that of *Aquileia*. These, coupled with our own great province of the *Britannic Isles*, ruled over by its native metropolitans from the very times of the Apostles, as before set forth, will form a sufficient picture of the ancient Church.

We see then at a glance the origin and the development of the Episcopal order, its gradual extension as time required, and its adaptation to the wants of the Church in proportion to its extent in space, and its increase in number. It seemed, as it were, a system of federative societies. Each bishop in his own city, each metropolitan in his own province, bound and knit together by common sympathies and common interests, labouring together for the advance of the whole. Coming down, each in their order from the Apostles, who had come from CHRIST, they would have one heart and one soul, and the world would be subdued by their united yet independent action, testifying in one great Body for the truth of their one great Head.

Time went on. The decay of the Church's internal purity began to tell upon the external

form of its government. Lust of power and unworthy ambition raised up unworthy men to the chief seats; and when emperors took into their own hands the appointment of the Church's holy offices, it was easy to predict how such offices would soon be perverted. The introduction of heresies, the continual appeal of the ecclesiastical to the civil power, the decay of morals, the utter loss, with some few exceptions, of that lowliness of spirit and suffering humility which distinguished the apostles and first bishops, coupled with a general secularity of mind, soon produced its sure results. Even the assumption of the metropolitan or primatial title was a step which denoted the possibility of an impending danger; and it was not likely, considering the nature of the power once grasped by or conceded to a human hand, that the Church would remain content in that first advance over the gentle simplicity of the ancient episcopal discipline.

As in the first instance we find the metropolitans stepping over the heads of the suffragans, so we find in the second instance the metropolitans stepping over the heads of each other. Some of the greater cities spread through the Roman Empire were dignified by the privileges of civil precedence, and they naturally desired a proportionate precedence in the things of the Church. Among these were principally three, Rome, Antioch, and Alexandria, all apostolic sees. First by tacit sufferance, and afterwards by custom of

time, the prelates of these three sees assumed the name of *Patriarchs*. To these three was afterwards added Constantinople when the seat of government was transferred thither from Rome, and some few other cities were gradually dignified with this name, such as Cæsarea and Ephesus.

With the title of *Patriarch*, involving the idea of the ancient government of the Jews, would immediately arise a vast increase of jurisdiction, and a wider field of power. It would seem that, like all other abuses, its first origin was obscure; that it crept on insidiously as the influence of the inferior bishops decreased; and though probably not openly spoken of before the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), still by that time it had taken so great a hold upon the Church system as then to become a recognised thing. The whole system, as well as the title, seems to be definitely settled at the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 381.

And thus the whole Church moved on in another great advance towards a monarchical government. Instead of the multitude of bishops, with their many Church assemblies, we now find a few choice monarchies and the government of large tracts of many countries committed to the dominion of one man. It was no longer, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles, Christian men co-operating with and deferring to one another for the good of the general community; but powerful and ambitious lords seemingly contending for the first places in the world. The unseemly contests

which took place during the Arian heresy ; the expulsions and returns of S. Athanasius ; the history of S. Basil, of S. Chrysostom, and many others who were pillars of the great fabric of the Church, would seem to show how much of the dross of this perishable world was still to be found in really noble minds. The fourth century is one long scene of civil and religious discord. Not only a contest and martyrdom of the disciples of the Cross struggling against the world, but the contest of brother against brother, and bishop against bishop ; intruding into each other's sees, denouncing, expelling, excommunicating, as the turn of the contest gave them the power, derived from imperial interference and State control. Even the canons of the greater Councils too often betray this evil spirit in the necessity by which they seem compelled to lay down the boundaries of dioceses, and the rights of patriarchs and metropolitans. They are continually occupied in saying what shall be, and what shall not be the order of precedence, or the place of dignity of such and such a patriarch ; repelling the unjust attacks of one upon the rights of another ; and defining the limits by which each shall be bound. Alexandria is jealous of Constantinople, and Rome of both. The bishop of each see is occupied in watching the attempts of the others, while too often the temporal power steps in and reduces the whole system of the Church to its own political purposes.

For instance: Constantinople was constituted a patriarchate, and destroyed the former rights and privileges of many metropolitans by the mere will of the Emperor Theodosius in the second General Council of Constantinople. This was done entirely and solely for the purpose of coinciding with the dignity with which the emperor desired to invest the new city; and it was distinctly said, that not only should Constantinople be a patriarchate, but that it should take precedence of Alexandria and all others, ranking second in order, and this solely because Constantinople was "*New Rome.*" The jealousies and disputes which arose out of this mere political decree are as unworthy of the character of the bishops who engaged in them, as they are unhappy signs of the decay of the primitive Christian spirit.

But let us see to what extent the patriarchal system affected the government of the Church.

To the patriarchs, as superior to the metropolitans, was confided the privilege of confirming and consecrating all the metropolitan bishops who were under them; of convening all the metropolitan and provincial bishops to the various synods, and presiding in those synods when convened; of receiving appeals in cases of dispute, which could not be definitely settled in their respective provinces; of citing, examining, and judging in cases of criminal wrong and violation of the canons; and of deposing such bishops and even metropolitans as were under ecclesias-

tical censure. In short, the power and jurisdiction over the whole patriarchate was precisely the same as that which had been the power of the metropolitan over his province.

Two things however must still be carefully observed as bearing on the great subject of the patriarchal system. First, that notwithstanding the accession of power thus placed by emperors and kings in the hands of a few chosen bishops, still the principal patriarchates thus established continued to be *entirely independent of each other.* At first, learned men reckoned that there were no less than thirteen or fourteen patriarchates, one for every capital city of each diocese of the Roman Empire,* the principal of which were those of Alexandria over Egypt, Antioch over the East, Ephesus over Asia, Cæsarea over Pontus, Rome over the Roman Prefecture, Milan in the Italic Diocese, Carthage in Africa, Lyons in France, Toledo in Spain, and York in the Diocese of Britain. Some indeed of these were afterwards absorbed and contracted within the boundaries of others; but all along Church history, the great patriarchates remained ever independent of each other. It is true that Cæsarea

* The word *diocese*, as used in the ecclesiastical division of the Church, does not signify that territory which is assigned to a common or suffragan bishop; but the whole *patriarchate.* A *diocese* was divided into provinces, and a *province* into sees. Over a diocese was a patriarch, over a province a metropolitan in the chief city, over a see the suffragan bishop.

and Ephesus were afterwards made in some respects subordinate to Constantinople; and most of the patriarchates of the West became involved in and subservient to that of Rome, by the unjust and uncanonical encroachments which that patriarchate succeeded in maintaining over the rest; but the greater and more celebrated patriarchates of Alexandria, Antioch, and Constantinople, have throughout all ages remained, and still to this day remain, in their perfect independence. To two of them, that is to Rome and Constantinople, were always conceded certain privileges as being the seats of Empire. They were called "*Royal seats*," and because in the first of them there existed the centre of all political power up to the time of Constantine, a certain precedency of honour was allotted to it, and after the time of Constantine the same was conceded to the new city Constantinople, as in the second rank, because, as was before observed, it became "New Rome."

The second point of observation is this, (and a most material one as affecting ourselves,) namely, that notwithstanding this partition of the Church generally into patriarchates, with subjection of the metropolitans of the different churches under them, there were *specific exceptions* made in several instances, by which, according to the canons of the General Councils, certain metropolitans were never placed under the jurisdiction of any patriarch at all, but were still left unfettered and uncontrolled by patriarchal power. These were

called by the ancient term of Αὐτοκέφαλοι or independent metropolitans. Among them are more particularly mentioned the Churches of Cyprus. Their case was decided at the Council of Ephesus (A.D. 431.) For when on the ground of his patriarchate the Bishop of Antioch claimed the right of ordaining bishops in Cyprus, it was canonically decreed that the Bishop or Patriarch of Antioch had no such right, and that the Bishops of Cyprus should ordain each other as Αὐτοκέφαλοι according to their immemorial custom. Now this canon thus made at a General Council is imperatively binding upon the Catholic Church. It not only decrees the case of Cyprus, but marks the principle by which all ancient Churches which have been "*from the beginning*" under their own metropolitans shall continue so, and not be subject to any foreign patriarch whatever. The canon is thus translated :—

"Wherefore since common disorders require a more effectual remedy as being productive of greater injury, and especially since there is no ancient custom alleged for the Bishop of Antioch ordaining in Cyprus, as these pious men who have had access to the holy synod have shewn by books and word of mouth : the prelates of the Church of Cyprus shall have the right, uninjured and inviolate according to the canons of the sacred fathers, and the ancient customs, themselves to confer orders upon the pious bishops ; AND THE SAME SHALL BE OBSERVED IN ALL OTHER

DIOCESES, (PATRIARCHATES), AND PROVINCES WHATSOEVER: SO THAT NONE OF THE BISHOPS, BELOVED OF GOD, SHALL TAKE ANOTHER PROVINCE, WHICH HAS NOT BEEN FORMERLY AND FROM THE BEGINNING SUBJECT TO HIM.

"But if any one has taken another and by force placed it under his control, he shall restore it; that the canons of the fathers be not transgressed nor the pride of worldly power be introduced under the cloak of the priesthood, nor we by degrees come to lose that liberty wherewith our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the deliverer of all men, has endowed us by His own Blood. It seemed good therefore to the holy and general synod, that the proper rights of each province, which have before-time from the beginning, by ancient custom belonged to it, be preserved to it pure and inviolate."*

Under this exemption, and on the same ground of "*ancient custom*," the British Churches have ever claimed the right of freedom from the jurisdiction of a foreign patriarch. It was always their custom, "*from the beginning*," *i.e.* from the time of the Apostles, and continued to be the custom at the time this canon was made, that bishops after bishops succeeded each other, consecrated each other, and obeyed each other, according to that "*ancient custom*" given to them "*from the beginning*," that beginning being hundreds of years before they had ever heard of the Bishop

* Conc. Ephesus vii., Canon viii.

of Rome. The canon of Ephesus is therefore the great bulwark of Catholic liberty. It embraces the British Churches; it embraces the surrounding Churches of Spain, Germany, Gaul, and Italy; it places England in exactly the position of Cyprus at the time the canon was made, precisely in fact, as she was, before the system of bishops and metropolitans gave way, and were lost in that of the patriarchs.

CHAPTER XI.

To the observant reader it will be plain that the whole stream of the Church had been all along setting towards the idea of a government based upon a monarchy. That which we see so conspicuously in the teaching of our LORD, as to the equal jurisdiction of the twelve Apostles, we do indeed perceive at first in the primitive bishops, but we quickly lose sight of it in the institution of the metropolitans; and even of that which existed in the metropolitans we quickly lose sight in the division of the Church into fourteen great patriarchates, embracing vast territories of the earth, with multitudes of inferior metropolitans and bishops, brought under the subjection of one man. But seeing that this idea of Church government arose and was maintained in consequence of union with the civil power; since, as we have seen, the metropolitan became such as

he was in consequence of his bishopric being the chief city; and the patriarch or exarch became such as he was in consequence of the division of the Roman Empire into provinces; since in fact, the government of the Church was evidently moulded and adapted to and imbided the spirit of the government of men; it was but the natural result that it should by degrees advance a step further in the same direction. There were indeed these thirteen or fourteen great provinces into which the Roman Empire was divided; but there was one single Roman Emperor over the whole. The provinces were not kingdoms, but tributary divisions of a great Empire. The civil governor of each was the subject of the Emperor, who first from Rome and afterwards from Constantinople directed his movements, and enforced the laws of the whole political body. Was it not almost unavoidable, that the policy of the world being once received in the lower portions of Church, should advance to the higher? The Church had not conquered the world, but was absorbed into it; had not enforced the laws of CHRIST, or taught the spirit of CHRIST, as of intrinsic superiority to the world; but had accommodated herself to it, and shaped herself by its maxims. Therefore it very soon came to pass that men of ambition pressed into the higher offices of the Church as they did into the higher offices of the State; and the same feeling which prompted ambitious generals to assume the pur-

ple and rule the world, prompted eminent patriarchs to assume the episcopal crown and rule the Church. On the principle of certain provinces of the Empire being more important than others, as in the first instance Rome; and when the seat of the Empire was transferred to the East, Constantinople; it was natural that the patriarchs of those two cities should assume the chief place. And if any idea should ever arise that the necessities of the Church, following the example of the Empire, should require one single head, or chief patriarch, it was natural to imagine that the struggle as to which should be the greatest should arise between those two. Some indeed for a time claimed pre-eminence on a different ground, namely as Apostolic seats, *i.e.* bishoprics founded by Apostles, such as Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem; and some again were brought from time to time to a degree of celebrity in consequence of the personal eminence of their prelates; but the real and ultimate struggle for power very soon developed itself on political grounds, in exact accordance with the struggle for power between the Eastern and the Western Empires. Accordingly when Constantinople or "new Rome" became a patriarchate, it gradually assumed the first place of the Eastern Church; while the elder Rome assumed the first place of the Western. Then the struggle began, and the Patriarchal government was soon lost sight of in the Papal. There was indeed for some little

time a choice between Rome and Constantinople, but one or the other of these Patriarchs must needs become sooner or later the Papal Head; the one sole governor and ruler of the Church throughout the world.

Now at first, strange to say, the claim of universal headship came not from Rome, but from Constantinople; and still more strange to say, the great opposition to it, on the highest Catholic grounds of the Church, came from Rome. Towards the close of the sixth century, John, Patriarch of Constantinople, aided and upheld by the Emperor of the East, assumed the title of Universal Bishop or Pope, and it fell to the lot of Gregory the Great, Patriarch of Rome—that Gregory to whom, through S. Augustine, the Anglo-Saxons owe their conversion—to contend against it. This he did in letters to the Emperor, protesting that this assumption was "a sign of Antichrist," and urging that it was but a prelude to the destruction of the Church. He also urged his brother Patriarchs of Alexandria, and of Antioch, to join him in resisting this claim, and when at last all was in vain against the power of the Emperor, Gregory renounced all connection with John as being a dangerous usurper of unjust power. He conveyed these sentiments to John himself, in a letter, as remarkable for its truly Catholic reasoning as for its testimony against those very identical assumptions, which were afterwards to be made by his own successors.

Gregory the Great, Patriarch of Rome, writes to John, Patriarch of Constantinople, when he claimed the title of "Universal Bishop," in these words:—

"Consider I pray you that by this rash presumption, the peace of the whole Church is disturbed, and the grace poured out upon all in common, contradicted. And in this indeed, you yourself will be able to increase just so much as you purpose in your mind; and become so much the greater, as you restrain yourself from usurping *a proud and foolish name;* and you will profit in the degree, that you do not study to arrogate to yourself, by derogating from your brethren. . . . . Surely the Apostle Paul hearing some say, 'I am of Paul, I of Apollos and I of Cephas,' exclaimed in exceeding horror at the rending of the LORD'S Body (by which His members attached themselves to other heads), saying 'was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?' If he then rejected the members of the LORD'S Body being subjected to certain heads besides CHRIST, and that even to Apostles themselves as leaders of parts; what will you say to CHRIST (Who is, you know, the Head of the Universal Church), in the examination of the last judgment? You, who endeavour to subject to yourself, under the name '*Universal*,' all its members? . . . Surely Peter, the first of the Apostles, is a member of the Holy Universal Church. Paul, Andrew, John; what else are

they but the heads of particular communities? And yet all are members under one Head; and to comprehend all in one brief expression—the saints before the law, the saints under the law, the saints under grace—all these making up the Body of the LORD are disposed among the members of the Church, and no one ever yet wished to be called "*Universal*." Let then your holiness acknowledge how great is your pride, who seek to be called by that name by which no one has presumed to be called who was really holy."*

But the history of the world soon after this made a great diversion. Constantinople and the whole of the Eastern Patriarchates fell under the inroads of the Mahometan power, and Christianity was well-nigh lost. What was preserved at all was preserved in the greatest difficulty, and too often accompanied with inward heresies and divisions among the different Churches. Then it was that Rome in her turn re-assumed the superiority of her position, and becoming intermingled with the rising political powers, which ultimately settled down into the great German Empire of Charlemagne and his successors, became the ruling patriarchate. As she received from them on one side political aggrandizement, she imparted to them on the other the sanction of religion. She advanced century after century, with more and more

* S. Gregor. lib. v. Ep. 18.

strength in her claim to that very universal dominion, which in the person of Pope Gregory the Great she had so forcibly denounced. Then in turn rose up the Eastern Patriarchs, feebly it is true, but still with determination, rejecting the attempts of the Bishops of Rome, even as before, the Bishops of Rome had rejected theirs. In this resistance, though finally separated in communion, they have ever continued. Appealing to the Canons, and abiding in the ancient discipline of the patriarchates as settled by the first four Councils, they have preserved their portion of the Church; and mainly owe their integrity of government, at the price of unity in communion, to the resistance they have ever stedfastly maintained against the Papacy of Rome. They are an abiding witness, that though the power of Rome, as it grew in the middle ages, is a great historical fact which we cannot contradict, yet it is contrary to the voice of the Universal Church.

But it *is* beyond doubt an historical fact, that in the West, the Papal power emerging from the Patriarchal did rule and govern; did receive the obedience of, and was hailed by, all the Churches of Italy, Spain, Gaul, Germany, and England; that the Pope of Rome was looked upon by them all, as the Universal Head; that his decrees were received as infallible dogmas of faith and of discipline; and that their liberty as national Churches was altogether fused in the universality of Rome.

And the question is, how can we account for this historical fact? When the canons are so explicit, when the testimony of the whole East is so plain, how was it that all the Western Patriarchates of the ancient Roman Empire, as we see them marked on the ecclesiastical map, were thus absorbed in the Papal supremacy, and the Province or Patriarchate of Great Britain among the rest, ceded its ancient privileges to Rome?

The question is answered by an appeal to the history of the political circumstances of the world. It was the political power of Rome as the chief city of the West. It was the weakness of the other nations absorbed into the German Empire. It was the concordat made between Rome as an ecclesiastical power, possessing privileges valuable in the eyes of ambitious kings, and those ambitious kings seeking the cloak of spiritual authority, to veil the designs of temporal power. Originally, as we have seen, the Roman Bishop ranked among his brethren as a brother, and while his primacy in order seems always to have been cheerfully conceded to him, he yet took his place among the patriarchs without any superiority of jurisdiction. Primacy in order did not involve supremacy in jurisdiction. But the kingdoms of the world in the eighth century underwent a momentous revolution. The Bishops of Rome in that century withdrew their allegiance from the Eastern Emperors. The Lombards were then the ruling power in the north of Italy; and

stood at the gates of Rome before the defenceless Pope. The Arabs pouring themselves over the West, had become masters of Spain, their general boasting that he would pass the Pyrenees, and preach Mahomet in the Vatican. What was to be done? How was Rome to be saved and the Christian faith preserved? But the Frankish monarchy was at the very same time rising into power under the second race of its kings; and among those Franks happily the seeds of the Catholic faith had been sown. They understood the emergency. Pepin, mayor of the palace, enjoying the power, but not the title of royalty, had rebelled against his master the lawful king of the Franks. The last descendant of Clovis survived in the feeble Childeric. The nobles and the people, bound by their allegiance, knew not how to rid themselves of Childeric, until the design was formed of appealing to the spiritual power. The interest of the Pope, as well as the imminent danger with which he was threatened, at once threw him on the side of Pepin. The new king undertook to defend the holy Church against the Lombards. He did so. He drove them out of the cities which they had conquered in the north of Italy, and specially that part of it which was called the Exarchate of Ravenna; but instead of restoring the regained territories to their lawful emperor in the East, he placed the keys of the conquered towns upon the Altar of S. Peter. In that act, he laid the foundation of the temporal

power of the Papacy. Then followed the spiritual payment for this service performed by Pepin in behalf of the Church; namely, his coronation.

"His coronation was twice performed with the sanction of the Popes, by their most faithful servants S. Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, and by the grateful hands of Stephen III., who, in the monastery of St. Denys, placed the diadem on the head of his benefactor. The successor of S. Peter assumed the character of a divine ambassador; a German chieftain was transferred into the LORD'S anointed."*

From this time, the rulers of the Carlovingian dynasty and the Pope of the Roman see interchanged without demur their offices of mutual aggrandisement. On the one hand Charlemagne becomes the supreme Emperor of the West, being crowned by the Pope on Christmas Eve of the year 800, thus founding the new Empire of Germany; and is absolved by the Pope from his allegiance to the Emperor of the East. On the other hand Leo III., Bishop of Rome, receives sovereign temporal power over the city, and territories adjoining Rome, and becomes the founder of a feudal principality under the protection of the German Emperors. And thus the concordat lasts for many years, until fresh revolutions and fresh ambitions of the papacy again prevail. And when we reach the time of Hildebrand, who

* Gibbon, ch. xlix.

became Pope under the name of Gregory VII., then, even the small vestige of subjection in temporal matters to the Emperors was altogether removed, and the Papacy stood forth in opposition to Henry IV., as a free, despotic, and independent sovereignty. How great was the power, how terrible the supremacy over men and things wielded by that great Pope we can easily imagine, when the Emperor of Germany, excommunicated and dethroned, is obliged to express himself in such language as this, in a letter to the Pope:—

"The rulers of the holy Church, archbishops, and bishops, and priests; all these thou hast trodden down beneath thy feet as it were slaves; and in trampling on them, as thou hast done, thou hast gained the applause of the people."*

And when such language as this is followed by the fact, that for three successive days Henry IV. stood at the outer gate of the castle, in the midst of snow, from morning till evening, waiting to lay himself prostrate at the feet of Gregory.

Here, then, we at once answer the question how the Patriarchate of Rome acquired its great extension of spiritual power. It was derived from the very contrary principle of that which our LORD had taught as involving the office of the Church. It derived its supremacy from its

* Letter from Henry IV. to Gregory VII. Ranke's "History of the Popes."

mixture with, its dependence on, and its assumption of, the kingdoms of the world. Add to which, being all this time separated from the East, it became the sole Apostolic see towards which any of the nations of the North or the West, in the ignorance of those dark ages, could look for spiritual guidance. The world was sinking under barbarian aggression. The African Church had fallen beneath the inroads of the Mahometans. Asia with many of its Churches was more or less involved in heresy. The ancient land of the primitive Apostolic faith ceased to possess the cross which JESUS Himself had planted on its soil. What wonder then that the spiritual dominion of the only Apostolic See of the West thus came forth among the nations of Europe as the sole representative of the Church. The monarchical power of kings, in its highest sense, was transferred to the monarchical power of the Bishop of Rome. And this no shadow, no theory, but a real substantial thing, which was seen and felt. The Pope still called the Bishops his venerable brethren; but he treated them as his subjects. They were to have no will but his in temporal matters; and no law but his even in those spiritual offices of the Church which they had hitherto imagined had been derived from CHRIST.

And now observe how, from this time, the Papal power expanded, and to what it ultimately attained. The Councils of the Church, which

had formerly been constituted by the whole East and West together, were now, by the separation of the two, summoned only in the West. Councils which had been convened by the Emperor were now convened by the Pope, in the double capacity of Bishop of Rome and a temporal sovereign. They were no longer Œcumenical or General, but Roman. The third Lateran Council was thus called by Pope Alexander III., A.D. 1179, by his sole voice as a sovereign king. Add to this, the Papal power now assumed itself to be superior to the Councils, even when they were convened. Gregory VII., A.D. 1074, laid down the law, that the first four General Councils, which he compares to the four gospels, were to be highly reverenced, but not so highly as the decrees of the Roman Pontiffs; for he says, "*Those very Councils would have no force unless the Pontiffs of the Apostolic chair had decreed that the same should be collected and confirmed by their* (*the Pontiffs'*) *authority.*"*

Furthermore, since it was easy to proceed from spiritual to temporal things, the idea soon grew that the kings of the earth were to owe their sovereignty over their subjects to the approbation, if not the appointment, of the Pope; and this being recognised, it was but a step further to acknowledge, that as kings were appointed, so they might be deposed. In the year 1059,

* Mansi, v. xx. 433.

Nicholas II. confirmed the Duke of Calabria and Sicily in the possession of his dominions, and the Duke swore fealty to the Pope. Alexander II. gave his Papal sanction to William the Norman when he invaded England, and established him in his usurpation. Alexander III. gave Henry II. the possession of Ireland; and Innocent IV. gave the kingdom of Portugal to the Count of Bologna, A.D. 1245. But of all the extraordinary powers now, in these middle ages, claimed and exercised in the face of the nations, was the deposition of kings, the absolving of subjects from their allegiance, and the placing of whole kingdoms under interdict; all this depending on the sole will of one man. The celebrated Gregory VII. released the subjects of the Emperor Henry IV. from their allegiance, and the form in which he did so is couched in this remarkable prayer:—

"Blessed Peter, Prince of the Apostles, incline thine ear to us, we beseech thee, and hear me thy servant. Thou art my witness, and my lady, the Mother of GOD, and S. Paul, thy brother, and all the saints, that the Roman Church brought me against my will to thy government; and therefore of thy grace, and not of my own good works, I believe it is that it hath pleased thee, and doth please thee, that thy people of CHRIST specially entrusted to thee, should obey me in your stead, and by your grace, power is given to me, by GOD,

to bind and loose in heaven and earth. Therefore, relying on this trust for the honour and defence of the Church in behalf of Almighty GOD, the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, I deny to Henry the government of the whole realm of Germany and Italy, and release all Christians from the bond of the oath which they have made or will make to him, and forbid any one to serve him as a king."*

History will tell of many such depositions, but none so great and remarkable as this; but of one we may speak, as more closely affecting ourselves, and under which, even in much later times, we have suffered in England itself; namely, the deposition of Queen Elizabeth by Pius V., A.D. 1569. And all this, be it remembered, was not merely the act of one here and there, as of some intemperate and hasty prelate; but it was a perfect system resting on the idea of the Pope being the vicegerent of CHRIST. Innocent III. declared that "GOD had ordained the Pope as CHRIST'S Vicar, to have power over all nations and kingdoms; to root out, and to destroy; to throw down, and to pull down; to build, and to plant;" thus applying to the Papacy the words of Jeremiah.† And Pope Boniface said: "Being set above kings and kingdoms by a divine pre-eminence of power, we dispose of them as we

* Mansi, xx. c. 277. † Jeremiah i. 10.

think fit;" and in the Bull called "Unam Sanctam," A.D. 1302, he concludes a kind of summary of what he thought was involved in the Papal supremacy, with these remarkable words:—

"Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce that it is altogether necessary for salvation, that every human creature should be subject to the Roman Pontiff."

And this power is carried on if possible into higher and more awful things; asserting sometimes the infallibility, at other times the impeccability of the Pope under the very attributes of GOD in forgiving sins—as Innocent III., who asserted thus:—

"The LORD suffered Peter alone to be vicegerent in office, and His successor in power. Therefore, after the LORD'S ascension, Peter began to govern the Church as His successor; who, when he had consecrated the Roman Church by his own blood, bequeathed the primacy of the chair to his successor, transferring to him the whole plenitude of power. . . . . The number seven, multiplied into itself, signifies the whole sins of all men—*all which Peter alone can remit.**

Nor does it depend alone upon these dicta of the Popes themselves; but upon councils of the Roman Church, which giving herself up en-

* Gesta Innocent. III. p. 43.

tirely to the will of the Papacy, sacrificed all for his individual power.

The fourth Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, excommunicates and deposes all kings who do not obey the Pope, and deprives all persons who deny his authority; while it even goes the length of demanding the obedience of the whole Greek Church to the supreme Pontiff, on peril of salvation. They are to "*submit themselves like obedient children to the holy Church of Rome their mother.*"*

And the Council of Florence, A.D. 1438, which comes nearer to our own times, still tells the same tale:—

"We decree that the holy Apostolic See and the Roman Pontiff has a primacy over the whole world, and that the Roman Pontiff himself is the successor of S. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles, and is the true Vicar of CHRIST, Head of the whole Church, Father and teacher of all Christians, and that to him, in the person of the blessed Peter, our Lord JESUS CHRIST has committed full power of feeding, ruling, and governing the Universal Church."†

The Council of Trent, 1545; and Clement VIII. 1600, continue the claims with unabated ardour. A form of oath was drawn up by Clement VIII., by which all bishops, on election to their sees, were sworn in obedience to the Pope, and

* Fourth Lateran Council, can. iii.

† Conc. Flor., Session xxv.

to observe the *royalties of S. Peter.** And among the "royalties of S. Peter" we find the following:—

"To have a plenitude of power by which he can infringe any law.

"To be so much superior to all other men, that none shall presume to tax his faults, or to judge his judgment.

"To possess the temporal and spiritual sword; and in right of the spiritual sword, to be superior to all sovereigns upon earth; nay, so much so, that it is held of necessity to salvation, for every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff.

"To have a right to dethrone heretical princes, absolve their subjects from their allegiance, and empower Catholics to exterminate them, and seize upon their lands.

"To render void promises, vows, oaths, and obligations to the law, by his dispensation.

"To be the fountain of all pastoral jurisdiction and dignity."

The whole essence of the power claimed may be finally summed up in these awful words declared by Innocent III.:—

"THE POPE IS THE VICAR OF JESUS CHRIST, THE SUCCESSOR OF PETER, THE ANOINTED OF THE LORD, THE GOD OF PHARAOH; SHORT OF GOD, BUT BEYOND

* There is a remarkable forgery connected with this word "Royalties," of which we shall have to speak hereafter.

MAN; LESS THAN GOD, BUT GREATER THAN MAN; WHO JUDGES ALL MEN, BUT IS JUDGED BY NO MAN."

Let the reader now look back upon the history of the world, and compare S. Peter, the Apostle of CHRIST, with those bishops who have boasted to succeed him on his episcopal throne of Rome —with Gregory VII., with Boniface VIII., with Innocent III., with Julius II., or with Alexander VI. Let him observe how, in those special instances, it seemed as if the spiritual office of a bishop was entirely lost sight of in the ambitious projects of a temporal prince; how, in the place of the lowly and suffering martyrs of the first Church, these great princes grew up from time to time, founding or maintaining a system of government in which the Church was entirely submitted to the priority of a secular power which held that Church but as a subservient minister to its own aggrandizement. We have advanced from the simple bishop to the metropolitan; from the metropolitan to the patriarch; from the patriarch to the Pope—and we now can understand what is meant by the "*Pope's supremacy.*"

But is this doctrine based upon reason or upon truth? Is it consonant with Holy Scripture? Does it agree with the canons of the Church? Is it supported by the testimony of the Fathers? These are the questions which will form the subject of our next inquiry.

For the present, let it be remembered, we have only been dealing with *historical facts*. But, com-

paring these historical facts with Scripture, we may safely appeal with S. Bernard in his advice to Pope Eugenius III.—"*What did the holy Apostles leave you? Was it any lordship? Nay, hear him yourself.* He says:—

"'FEED THE FLOCK OF GOD AMONG YOU, NOT AS BEING LORDS OVER GOD'S HERITAGE, BUT BEING EXAMPLES TO THE FLOCK.'

"And that you may not think it said from humility alone, instead of truth, there is the voice of the LORD Himself in the Gospels.

"'THE KINGS OF THE GENTILES EXERCISE LORDSHIP OVER THEM, BUT IT SHALL NOT BE SO AMONG YOU.'"

CHAPTER XII.

IF it be true, as we find the claim of the Romanists to assert, that the See of S. Peter contains within it, of divine right, a supremacy over all things in the Catholic Church; it follows that the Church of England, the Greek Churches, the Church of Holland, the Church of Scotland, the Church of America; in short, every national Church throughout the world, which does not recognise that supremacy, is out of the pale of salvation. If it be true that the Roman Pontiff, as we have seen it assumed to be, has temporal as well as spiritual jurisdiction over all the world, and can depose kings, set aside all na-

tional authority, and absolve subjects from their allegiance; such jurisdiction as, in fact, we have seen realized in the history of the world; then, with all our boasted liberty in this country, should circumstances ever again give a handle for the exercise of such power, the crowns of our kings and the freedom of our laws would tremble once more in the balance of politics. And again, if it be true that the Church of Rome, in the person of its Prelate, and the Kingdom of Rome, in the person of its Sovereign, contains within it the sole fountain of all ecclesiastical authority, is alone the source of the priesthood of the Church, and that the judgments made by the Pope, either for doctrine or for discipline, are at once and for ever sealed with the stamp of infallibility, then it follows that at any time, if it be not already so in the estimation of Romanists, the Bishops of the Church of England may have no power whatever to rule, to ordain, or consecrate; and the priesthood no power to preach or administer sacraments; and consequently the people would be in a condition of not in reality receiving any sacrament, blessing, or spiritual act of any kind at the hands of their clergy. In short, the whole fabric of the Church system, as it is in England, totters to the ground, and is null, depending, as in that case it would do, upon the will of one infallible head and one irresponsible will, whose word would be tantamount to the Law of God.

It is fair, however, to say that there is a great division of the Roman Church on these points. For, with all the boasted unity of their system, a great difference of opinion has arisen, and still exists, among their chief doctors, as to the extent of the personal infallibility of the Pope, as to the precise limits of his jurisdiction, and as to the temporal power invested in him. The Gallican School deny these points, while the Ultramontane or strictly Papal party maintain them in all their extremes. But it must be observed that the Gallican party maintain, equally with the Ultramontane, that the Pope is the centre of unity, and that any Church not joined to that centre of unity violates Catholic principles.* It is grateful, then, to see that, at any rate, there has been a wish expressed in some quarters for the abandonment of those extraordinary statements which the Church of Rome has from time to time put forth, as described in the last chapter, but seeing that those statements have never been recalled by any public act of authority, and since they have been stamped by the decrees of the Synod of Trent, there is an inconsistency in the opposition of the Gallican party; for, if Rome is of necessity the centre of unity, and if to be joined to the centre of unity is vital to salvation, how

* Bossuet is the principal writer of the Gallican party. For a fuller investigation of this the reader should consult his work entitled "Defensio Declarationis Cleri Gallicani."

can it possibly be that a Church denying any point of faith which that unity asserts (such centre of unity being by their own premises infallible) should still be a Church? The Gallican party cannot, at the same time, believe that the Pope is the centre of unity, and not believe his infallibility, because the Pope tells them in return that he is infallible, and must be believed by them to be infallible, as a condition of their unity. It is clear, then, that there can be no real modification of that whole and complete doctrine of Papal supremacy which is derived from the later Roman Councils, and that it still remains in its fullest sense the doctrine of the Roman Church.

The great question, then, resolves itself into this, as embracing everything else within it. Is the Papal supremacy, which expresses its dogma that no Christian man can be saved unless he be in communion with Rome, a true dogma? We must examine the grounds of this assertion.

The assertion is made, first, by appealing to Holy Scripture. It is asserted that S. Peter received from our Blessed Lord a specific command, authority, and jurisdiction *over all the other Apostles;* and the assertion is followed by another, namely, that these privileges so conveyed were meant to be handed down to all S. Peter's successors, he being the first Bishop of Rome, and that whatever was said to him was said to *all Bishops of Rome*.

Let us take in order the principal places of Holy Scripture wherein mention is made of any commission given to S. Peter. They are these:—

1. S. Matt. xvi. 13.—This passage concludes with a promise given by our LORD in return for the expression of S. Peter's faith. "And I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it; and I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven."

2. S. John xxi.—"So when they had dined, JESUS saith to Simon Peter, Simon son of Jonas, lovest thou Me?" and this question He thrice repeated, concluding with the words: "Feed My sheep."

3. The fact that S. Peter's name stands first in all the catalogues of the Apostles, and that he is always first in the great transactions of the Gospel dispensation, for example:—

He *first* walks upon the sea to embrace CHRIST. (S. Matt. xiv. 28.)

He *first* defends his LORD by drawing his sword against the soldiers. (S. John xviii. 10.)

He *first*, in the consultation about supplying the place of Judas, proposes and presses the matter. (Acts i. 15.)

He *first*, before the Jewish rulers, takes upon himself to speak. (Acts ii. 14.)

He *first*, of the Apostles, saw CHRIST after His resurrection.

He *first* received the converted Jews, and worked miracles for them.

He *first* received the Gentiles in the person of Cornelius.

To all this we answer, as to the *facts*, of course they are undeniable, and as far as a *Primacy* is concerned, that primacy being one of *worth*, of *reputation*, or of *precedence*, as Bishop Barrow has observed, there need be no disputing. There is unquestionably an eminence, a forwardness, at all times to do his LORD's work, very conspicuous in the character of S. Peter; but may not that very forwardness have been the cause of that great denial of his LORD, in which, alas! he stands equally conspicuous, and in which he fell as no other Apostle did? Upon this basis, however, together with his being found afterwards at Rome taking his Apostolic seat and founding a bishopric there, the Church has ever been ready to give the first place to that great Apostle, and with him the first place to his successors, the Bishops of Rome, for ever.

But that *Primacy*, which may fairly and consistently be derived from a view of the Apostolic character, and the passages of Scripture above noted, does not involve the SUPREMACY which is

advanced by the Roman Church. Let us now see that it does not.

1. First then, in regard of that passage of Scripture which mentions "*The Rock.*" The occasion on which this word is used would seem to be interpreted thus. All the rest of the Jewish world had ambiguous or erroneous ideas about the person of the Messiah. JESUS questions Simon, and Simon at once gives the true exposition of the faith. Upon this our LORD gives Simon a new name, πέτρος, which he derives from πέτρα, a rock, saying that the reason of this new name was, the firmness and decision in which he (Simon) had expressed his faith. And then He adds: "And upon this rock;" but observe, not πέτρος the man, but πέτρα the rock; "on this rock I will build My Church." What rock? Why evidently *the expression of faith*. Thus much would appear on the first reading of the text, fairly and honestly derived from the Greek language, in which it is written.

But since we do not wish to interpret Scripture for ourselves, but would rather rely on the interpretation of the Fathers, let us at once apply to them.

Now with regard to the word "rock," it is perfectly clear from a candid perusal of the Fathers as a whole, that there is no one certain opinion to be found on the subject; no one certain interpretation to be derived from their writings. Some of them say that the word rock

means *the Apostles generally;* others that it means *our Lord Himself;* while others say it is *the faith expressed by S. Peter.* As far then as the Fathers are concerned it is left as an open question. S. Augustine gives in different places different interpretations, sometimes saying that the rock was Peter himself, at other times that it was the *faith* of Peter, or the faith of the Church represented by S. Peter. The following extract will show the reader how uncertain and indefinite this was :—

I. "I have said somewhere of blessed Peter that the Church was built upon him as a rock, a meaning which is sung by many in the verses of blessed Ambrose. . . . . But I know that I have since very often expounded that what was said by the LORD, '*Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build My Church,*' should be understood of *Him Whom Peter confessed,* when he said, '*Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*' And thus Peter so named from the rock, would represent the person of the Church, which is built upon this rock; and received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven. For it was not said to him 'Thou art a rock' (*petra*), but, 'Thou art Peter, (*Petrus*), but the Rock was CHRIST, Whom when Simon confessed, as the whole Church confesses Him, he was called Peter (*Petrus*)."

And then he concludes, as though the matter was of no great moment—

"*But let the reader choose whichsoever of these two opinions may be the more probable.*" *

2. S. Chrysostom says :—

"Upon this rock; *i.e. upon the faith of his profession.*"

"CHRIST said that He would build His Church upon *Peter's confession.*"

"Upon this rock, He said, not upon Peter, for He did not build His Church upon the *man*, but upon his *faith.*" †

3. S. Cyril of Alexandria says :—

"And I say unto thee, thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build My Church. Calling, I imagine, nothing else the rock (in allusion to his name), but the *immoveable and most stable faith of the disciple*, on which the Church of CHRIST is founded, and fixed without danger of falling." ‡

But we must turn from the expression of "the rock," to that of "the keys," coupled with the phrase connected with it of "binding and loosing."

Now is the power of "the keys" given alone to S. Peter? Far from it. It is true, that at this particular time in which our LORD speaks of "the rock," it *is* spoken to S. Peter alone, but the very same power is given to the other Apos-

---

* S. Augustine, Retractat. l. i. c. 21.

† In Matt. xvi. 18. In Joan i. 50.

‡ S. Cyril, de Trinitate, 4. tom. v. p. 507.

tles at another time; as in S. Matt. xviii. 28: "Whatsoever things YE shall bind on earth, shall be bound in Heaven;" and again in S. John xx. 28: "Whosesoever sins ye remit, they shall be remitted, and whosesoever sins ye retain, they are retained." And again when our LORD for the last time, the very last time at which He gave forth His authority, called all the Apostles together, He certainly did not single out S. Peter or any other one Apostle, upon whom to confer that authority. That surely would have been the time to do so, if it had been intended. But not so. To them all collectively He said, "All power is given to Me in heaven and earth. Go *ye* therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, and teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo I am with *you* always, even unto the end of the world." S. Matt. xxviii. 19. With whom would He be? S. Peter alone? S. Peter above the rest? There is no such commission, no such selection, no such setting one above the other; but it is to all equally, with all equally, and through all equally, that His voice is to go forth to all the nations of the world.

But let us hear the Fathers in their interpretation of this point.

1. *Origen* says:—

"If thou thinkest that the whole Church is built upon Peter only, what dost thou say of

John, the son of thunder, and every one of the other Apostles? Or shall we dare to say that the gates of hell were not to prevail especially against Peter? Were they then to prevail against the other Apostles and the faithful? Is it not plain that to all and to each the assurance is made that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it? and this also, 'Upon this rock I will build my Church.' Is it to S. Peter alone, that the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven are given, and shall none other of the blessed receive them? But if this, 'I will give thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven,' be common, how also are not all things common, which were spoken before or are added, as spoken to Peter."*

2. *S. Augustine* says, clearly interpreting the address to S. Peter, as merely given through him to the whole Church :—

"The Lord JESUS chose out His disciples before His Passion, as ye know, whom He named Apostles. Among these, Peter alone almost everywhere was thought worthy to represent the whole Church. On account of that very representing the whole Church, which he alone bore, he was thought worthy to hear the words, 'I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven.' For these keys, not one man, but the Unity of the Church received. . . . . For that you may

* Origen, in Matt. xvi. p. 275.

know that the Church has received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, hear what the LORD says, in another place, *to all His Apostles*—'Receive the Holy Ghost.' And presently—'Whosesoever sins ye remit,' &c."*

3. *S. Jerome* says in express words, that "All the Apostles did receive the keys;" † and

4. *S. Ambrose*, "All we bishops in S. Peter received the keys of the Kingdom of Heaven;" ‡ and

5. *S. Theophylact* says, "Although it be spoken to Peter alone, 'I will give thee,' yet it is given all the Apostles." §

6. S. Gregory Nazianzen beautifully describes the community of the Apostles, showing how each had some kind of preference, and yet all equal:—

"Thou seest that among the disciples of CHRIST, who were all indeed great and eminent, and deserving such election, this one is called a rock, and receives in faith the foundations of the Church; another is loved more exceedingly, and reclines upon the breast of JESUS. And the

* S. Aug., Sermo. ccxcv. In Natali Apost. Petri et Pauli.
† Hierom, in Jovin. i. 14.
‡ Ambrose, De Dignit. Sac. 1.
§ Theophylact, in loco.

other disciples endure the preference bestowed upon these with an equal mind. When they were to ascend the mount, that CHRIST might shine forth and display His divinity, who were those that went up with Him? (for all were not admitted to see that wonder.) Peter, John, and James, and these were counted before the rest. Again, when a little before His Passion, anxious in spirit, and giving Himself to prayer, He required some to be with Him, who were they that were called? The very same. The preference in this matter was that of CHRIST, but in the rest how great was their order and equality. Peter asks one thing, Philip another, Judas another, Thomas another. Neither do all ask the same, nor does one ask everything; but each by turns and severally. You will here perhaps say, that each asked what he had need of. How should it seem so? Philip desires to say somewhat, but he dares not alone, and therefore brings Andrew with him. Peter wishes to make an inquiry, and procures John to do it by a motion of the head. Where in all this is any austerity? where any lust of domination?"*

II. We must now approach the second of our Scripture passages, one on which the Church of Rome sets very great stress; namely, the passage of S. John, "*Feed My sheep.*"

Undoubtedly, by the words "Feed My sheep," repeated three several times, is a commission given to

S. Peter of pastoral guardianship over the Church. He is told that he is an Apostle to tend the flock of his Divine LORD; but the question is, whether the words convey anything peculiarly to S. Peter at that time, more than had been conveyed at previous times; or was to be conveyed to all the other Apostles. When S. Paul says to the Bishop of Ephesus, "*Feed the Church of God*," does it follow that the Bishops of Ephesus were the only bishops who were so to feed the Church of GOD? Can it be argued from a direction in the affirmative to an individual, that all others are restrained by an implied negative? This would not be safe reasoning. The commission in general had been given before—"As My Father hath sent Me, so send I you." These words to S. Peter alone do not invalidate that which had been given before to all.

But the Fathers again will be our best guides. They join this passage with the preceding one, and have, upon the whole, pronounced against its containing any individual superiority in S. Peter. For instance:—

1. *S. Augustine* says:

"Deservedly, after His resurrection, the LORD delivered His sheep to Peter himself to feed, but *he was not the only one among the disciples who was thought worthy to feed the* LORD'S *sheep*."*

* Tom. v. 1195 E.

And again :—

"Therefore to Peter, whom He wished to make a good shepherd, He saith, not in the person of that individual Peter, but as in His own Body—'Peter, lovest thou Me? Feed My sheep.' This He saith once, this twice, a third time, so as to cause him sorrow . . . . Understand then how the Lord JESUS CHRIST is both Door and Shepherd; and indeed, brethren, in that He is a Shepherd, He hath bestowed this on His members; for both Peter is a shepherd, and Paul is a shepherd, and the other Apostles are shepherds."*

2. *S. Ambrose* says :—

"Which sheep, and which flock, not only then S. Peter did receive, but also with him all we priests did receive."†

3. *S. Chrysostom* says :—

"Our LORD did commit His sheep to Peter, *and to those which should come after him.*"‡

4. *S. Basil* says :—

"We are taught this by CHRIST Himself constituting S. Peter pastor, after Himself, of the Church; for saith He, 'Dost thou love Me more than these? Feed My sheep;' *conferring on all*

* Tom. iii. p. 2, 607. † S. Amb. De Sacerd. ii.
‡ Chrysost. De Sacerd. i.

pastors and teachers continually afterwards an equal power; whereof it is a sign that all do, in like manner, bind and loose as he."*

But the most remarkable testimony is from

5. *S. Cyril of Alexandria.* He does not interpret the expression, "*Feed My sheep,*" as in any way conferring a power upon S. Peter which he had not received before; but thinks that it is rather an admonition of our LORD to him in consequence of his previous denial. It seemed as if it were requisite that some renewal of his commission should be given, the former having been impaired by the fall of the Apostle. Thus then he says:—

"Therefore, by the triple confession of blessed Peter, the offence of triple denial was done away. But by the LORD's saying, 'Feed My sheep,' a renewal, as it were, of the Apostolate already conferred upon him is understood to take place, wiping away the intervening reproach of the fall, and effacing the littleness of human infirmity."†

III. And now, lastly, we approach those texts which place S. Peter's name first in the catalogue of the Apostles, and those other texts where he is mentioned first in the acts of the Church.

---

* Basil, Cont. Mont. c. 22. † S. Cyril, tom. iv. 1120.

There is certainly a remarkable coincidence in the catalogues of the Apostles, which invariably give S. Peter's name first. See S. Matthew x. 2, and the parallel places: "Now the names of the twelve Apostles are these: *the first Simon*." But is that a sufficient ground for the extraordinary supremacy set forth as the doctrine of Rome? His being *first* may be conceded, but that does not make him *supreme*.

But it is not the fact that Peter's name stands invariably first if we look to other texts exclusive of those which give the catalogue of the Apostles. For instance, in Gal. ii. 9, Cephas (Peter) is placed second; so also in 1 Cor. iii. 22; and in S. John i. 45. So that, as far as such an observation is worth, we do *not* find S. Peter on all occasions placed before the other Apostles.

It is true again that in many remarkable transactions of the opening of the Church S. Peter stands first. It was in harmony with the natural vehemence and earnestness of his character; and Tertullian mentions it as one of the interpretations of "the power of the keys" entrusted to him that he was the first to open the Kingdom of Heaven: "He first, in Christian baptism, unlocked the entrance of the Heavenly Kingdom."* He certainly does appear in the opening chapters of the Acts of the Apostles the foremost in the van, preaching, and teaching,

* De Pudicitia, c. xxi. p. 574.

and baptising; but to argue thence that such a supremacy is intended by our LORD as the Church of Rome would have, is, to say the least of it, but childish.

But even this is entirely confined to the first commencement of the Church. Read further on, and trace the position of S. Peter as the Church expanded from mere Judaism into the Catholic reception of the whole Gentile world within her fold. Read of S. Peter when he became associated with S. Paul, when the Churches of Asia and Greece rose up on all sides, and when contests and disputes began concerning discipline and faith. In proportion as the Gentile Church is developed, so do we find less and less said of S. Peter as in any way conspicuous before the rest of the Apostles; but rather do we find S. Paul.

To speak generally, S. Peter is not called by any other name, nor distinguished by any other title, than the rest of the Apostles. Our LORD, it is said by S. Paul, "gave some apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers." (Ephes. iv. 11.) And again: "GOD hath set some in His Church, first, apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." (1 Cor. xii. 28.) Now, if it had been as the Church of Rome says, would not these have been the places where the order of that apostle, who was above all other Apostles (if it had been so), would have been mentioned? In that latter text, for in-

stance, it would have been said, "*First Peter*, secondly apostles, thirdly prophets, fourthly teachers." But not so. We hear of no such order, no such precedence.

Again. Take those places where S. Peter is speaking of himself, or where, as an Apostle, he is giving his Apostolic direction. Does he do it with any claim of authority above others? He says to the bishops of the Church, "Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of GOD." (1 Pet. v. 2.) Would not that have been the place to speak of himself, as giving them, from his own authority, their mission, if it had been so. But no. He appropriates nothing to himself which the other Apostles had not. Again he says, "Be mindful of the commandment [not of me, but] of *us*, the Apostles of the LORD." (2 Pet. iii. 2.) And again: "The elders among you I exhort, who am also [not the chief Apostle—the sole head—the supreme governor—but] an elder, and a witness of the sufferings of CHRIST." (1 Pet. v. 1.) He takes his place but as one among the elders, not as chief.

When the council was held about circumcision, described in Acts xv., it is true that S. Peter took the initiative, and explained to the assembly what had happened in his own case; but it was Paul and Barnabas that brought the question

forward, and they took an equal share in the debate with S. Peter. The debate having concluded, was it S. Peter that gave the judgment? Surely he would have done so had he been the head of the Apostles; but, on the contrary, it was S. James that gave the judgment. Neither again, in the same case, was it S. Peter that wrote the decree of the Church to the Brethren of the Gentiles. He surely would have done so, or, at any rate, his name would have stood first in it, had he been, in the Roman sense, head of the Apostles; but, on the contrary, his name is not mentioned in the decree at all. He is merely joined with the other Apostles, and elders, and with the whole Church, "The apostles, and elders, and brethren, to the Brethren of the Gentiles." (Acts xvi. 4.)

Take again the case of S. Paul when he had need to reprove the Corinthians for their many dissensions. S. Paul mentions the names which stood at the heads of the parties; and he says, rebuking them, "I am of Paul, I am of Apollos, I am of Cephas [Peter], and I am of CHRIST." (1 Cor. i. 12, and iii. 22.) Now, supposing that the doctrine of S. Peter's supremacy had been known among the Apostles, is this the way in which S. Peter's name would have been introduced; not by any means as the head of the Church, but merely as the head of a party? And is this the way in which the Apostle Paul would have written concerning him, not making

the slightest allusion to any authority superior to his own?

Again. Let us turn to the second chapter of Galatians, in which S. Paul describes the scene of going up to Jerusalem, and alludes to S. Peter as merely the Apostle of the circumcision, while he himself was the Apostle of the Gentiles. (Gal. ii. 8.) He does not put Peter *first*, but says, "When James, Cephas, and John, who seemed to be pillars." He places all three together—not one above another, but all as equal; whilst he also seems to allude, in what we might indeed characterise as very strong language, to his determination to adhere to his own opinion in the matter discussed, and not to give heed to S. Peter, "To whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour;" and then again, "But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me, *God accepteth no man's person;* for they *who seemed to be somewhat, added nothing to me.*" And even still further, in this very same chapter, alluding to a different time, but the same subject, "When Peter was come to Antioch,"—and there arose some sort of compromise of the truth regarding the Gentiles; and "Barnabas had been carried away by his (Peter's) *dissimulation.*" What did S. Paul? "I withstood him to the face," he says, "because he was to be blamed." And still further, at some length, S. Paul rebukes him because he and his party "*walked not up-*

rightly according to the truth of the Gospel." (See Gal. ii. 11—14.) Now, surely this is neither the language nor the conduct of one who had any idea that the person to whom he was speaking was by divine right the head of the Church, the supreme Apostle, the special Vicar of CHRIST. Rather should we not say, reading this chapter with an unbiassed mind, and combining it with others of S. Paul's writing, and especially 2 Cor. xi., that if any one spoke with authority, led the Church, and acted as though he were above the others, it was not S. Peter, but S. Paul? At any rate, since the Church was at that time partly composed of Gentiles, and partly of Jews, does it not show most unequivocally that, whatever was the case with the Jews, S. Paul claimed to himself at least the headship over the Gentiles. S. Chrysostom so understands it, for he says:—

"CHRIST committed the Jews to S. Peter, but set Paul over the Gentiles."*

It would seem almost needless to say anything further on the subject of Holy Scripture. As far as that branch of the argument is concerned, the claim for the divine right of *the supremacy of S. Peter* must in every candid mind be abandoned. The Holy Scriptures will not bear it out. And if it be not found in Holy Scripture, there can be no divine right; for if the Holy Ghost, speaking there by the voice of the Church, is silent,

* S. Chrys., t. v. Or. 59.

there is no other place where the divine right can be heard. But it may be said, in giving up the ground of Holy Scripture, "Well, at least, the actual practice and working of the Church from the apostolic time downwards, *that* shows that this right of supremacy was inherent in S. Peter. Even if it be conceded that it might not have been directly taught in so many words, yet at least the seed was sown in the Holy Scripture, *to be afterwards developed in the practice of the Church.*"

Well, then, to examine this point will be our next duty.

CHAPTER XIII.

Supposing that the Holy Scriptures had been ever so clear and definite in attributing a supremacy to *S. Peter* (which however they are not), still there would be two main considerations to be fulfilled before we could arrive at that peculiar supremacy which is demanded for the *Bishop of Rome*. For first, it would need to be proved from the same Holy Scriptures that S. Peter was not only an Apostle, but also, in the peculiar sense in which the Church uses the word, *Bishop* of Rome ; and secondly, it would need to be proved that all which was attributed to S. Peter, was meant to be attributed to his successors for ever.

But neither of these points are possible to be shown from Holy Scripture. It is not even by Romanists asserted that they are; but the ground-work of this consideration is alleged to be the undoubted tradition of the Church.

We should never for a moment deny but that the tradition of the Church, coinciding, as of necessity it must, if true, with Holy Scripture, may be a ground-work of faith: *i.e.* upon such subjects as Holy Scripture does not make any explicit statement. For instance: Infant Baptism. There the tradition of the Church is the evidence of God's will, to which, as good Catholics, we are bound to submit. And therefore we might freely say, that if it were a clear tradition of the Church, that after the martyrdom of S. Peter and S. Paul, a successor to S. Peter, as Bishop of Rome, was appointed by the Church, and that, from facts immediately or soon after transpiring, such supreme authority was exercised by that bishop or bishops as would convey the kind of supremacy over all the other bishops which the Church of Rome now asserts; then the Papal supremacy has a valid claim upon our belief as a true catholic dogma.

But it must be observed very clearly, that the conclusion desired to be established by the Romanists falls to the ground on every single portion of the argument.

First. No supremacy at all is proved to have

existed in S. Peter; but only a primacy of order.

Secondly. This primacy of order, such as it was, is never mentioned as successive or inheritable, but only personal.

Thirdly. It is not certain that S. Peter was Bishop of Rome at all; but it is on the contrary probable, that being an Apostle, he appointed, in conjunction with S. Paul, another or others to govern the Church of Rome as bishop, in the same manner as he had done before at Antioch. In fact, we know, upon the authority of Tertullian and Irenæus, that S. Peter appointed first Linus, probably afterwards Cletus, and again afterwards Clement, to be Bishops of Rome during his life.

Fourthly. If even all the three preceding points were clearly made out as the Romanist party would wish, there still remains the utter uncertainty of the concluding inference; namely, that the powers of S. Peter, whatever they might be, were to be inherited and continued by succession to the individual bishop of the individua See of Rome for ever. And this, let the reader observe, is the great question.

That the bishops were *generally*, and in a body, successors of the Apostles, we know to be a sure

tradition of the Church, founded on the divine promise, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," and verified by the transmission of the Holy Spirit in the laying on of the hands of the Apostles throughout all the Churches. But this general and equal succession of bishops to apostles, and bishops to bishops *everywhere*, is a very different thing from the peculiar, special, and personal succession of one bishop to one apostle in one see; which succession claims universal dominion over all the rest of the Church. *But this is the Romanist's claim.*

Now the question is, will history bear it out? Assume for a moment that the first, the second, and the third stages of the argument are true; namely, 1. That there *was* supremacy in S. Peter over the other Apostles. 2. That this supremacy was given him as a privilege to be inherited by others. 3. That S. Peter was, in the Church's sense of the word, Bishop of Rome. Assume for a moment that this is all true—what then? Would not the conclusion which the Romanists desire to make, namely, *that the Popes of Rome have a Divine supremacy for ever over the whole Church*, be so legibly written on the pages of history that no one could mistake concerning it? Surely we should see its visible, plain, and unmistakable signs in the immediate history of the Church. We should see on all occasions, and without any doubt, all the bishops in every other see submitting to this

great, divine, manifest authority. We should see all questions of doctrine and of discipline decided summarily by this one great divinely-guarded voice. We should see such clear acts of dominion displayed as would verify the claim of the tradition which is asserted; and all the world which knew CHRIST would equally know that the Bishop of Rome was the sole ruler and expositor of His truth. But what if the pages of history do *not* verify this conclusion? What if, on the contrary, they verify the reverse of it? What if the whole Church in action after the Apostles' time knows nothing whatever concerning it? Why then the whole conclusion, and the arguments on which it rests, fall at once to the ground; and not only that, but the reverse of the conclusion stands forth as the truth of GOD. We must grapple then with facts of history. They must speak for us. They must show us the truth. On them we must rely, as upon witnesses which cannot mislead.

Every one is of course aware that in *after times*—in ages long after the Apostles—the signs of such Papal supremacy as we speak of *did* exist; such a voice of authority *did* speak; and such claims of dominion *were* submitted to. But that is not the question. If the power is of *divine right*, if it comes from GOD, we shall see it *immediately*. We shall not see it slumber for five or six centuries and then burst out; but we shall see it *at once;* and most certainly we shall not

see the reverse of it; we shall not see the whole Church growing on from age to age in ignorance of it, and the Bishops of Rome themselves living and speaking as though they knew nothing of it.

Let, then, the simple facts of history be our appeal. Were the Bishops of Rome in reality, during the early ages, what the Romanists now claim their Pope to be?

1. Very shortly after the martyrdom of S. Peter and S. Paul, dissensions grew up, as indeed they ever seem to have done, in the Church of Corinth. S. Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 91 to 100) imitating S. Paul, writes them a letter. It is one of the very earliest writings, and comes nearest in degree of authority to the canonical Scriptures themselves. In this letter then, with the authority of supreme bishop just closely conferred upon him (if it had been so), we should look for language in conformity with that authority. The Corinthians had deposed their bishops, and rebelled against their spiritual superiors. Their whole Church was a scene of discord. S. Clement speaks to them of the graces of humility, patience, and love. But he does not write to them in any degree as assuming any power over them as universal Bishop. These are his words:—

"Our Apostles knew, through JESUS CHRIST our Lord, that there would be contention about the

name of Episcopacy, and for this reason, being endued with perfect foreknowledge, they appointed certain persons, and handed down an order of succession, so that when they (the first bishops) should depart, other approved men should take their office and ministry. These men, therefore, who were appointed by them, or by others in order, with the consent of the whole Church; men who fulfilled this office in the fold of CHRIST, humbly, quietly, and liberally, and received for a long time honourable testimony—these men, we think unjustly deposed. For our sin will not be light if we cast down from the Episcopate those who have fulfilled their office with holiness and without blame."*

Now surely this is not the language of one who claimed obedience to *himself*, as to one endued with supreme power from GOD. He speaks of "*the whole Church*," but not of himself. Why does he not say, as would have been said afterwards by a Hildebrand or a Boniface—"I, as the Vicar of CHRIST, and the universal Bishop, holding S. Peter's chair, decree that you take your bishop back." No. This is not the language of those times. The duty of which S. Clement reminds them, is the duty they owe to their own pastors; he says nothing of the duty they owe to *him*. We conclude therefore that any such duty did not exist.

---

* S. Clem. ad Corinthos, Ep. i. § 44. Cotelerius.

2. At the end of the second century Victor was Bishop of Rome. His custom, together with the whole Western Church and part of the Eastern, was to celebrate Easter on the Sunday following the fourteenth day of the March moon. But those Churches which were under the jurisdiction of Ephesus observed their Easter on the fourteenth day itself, whether Sunday or not. Victor, after much controversy, excommunicated these Asiatic Churches, simply because they would not agree with the customs of the West. But Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, defied Victor, and maintained his right to follow the apostolic custom of the East, handed down, as he proved, from S. John. After reciting the various Apostles and Saints who had ever kept Easter in the Asiatic manner, he then goes on to say, in answer to Victor's excommunication—

"And I, Polycrates, that am the least of all, according to the traditions of my kinsmen, sundry of whom I thus follow—I brethren, having been the LORD's disciple sixty-five years, having conferred with my brethren throughout the world and having studied Holy Scripture, am not alarmed at what I am threatened with. For those greater than I have said, We must obey GOD rather than men."*

He alludes to the bishops whom he convoked. He does not act upon his own opinion, but by the Church represented around him. Many even of

* Eusebius, lib. v. 24.

the Western bishops took his part, among whom principally the martyr Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons. Letters of S. Irenæus are extant in which Victor is reproved for his unjust and violent attack; and in short, the whole force of Victor's excommunication merely ended in excommunicating himself. The Bishop of Ephesus stands clear and justified, and the Bishop of Rome is no more recognised as the supreme authority than any other of the bishops around him.

3. That which happened in the second century in regard to Pope Victor, was developed more strongly in the third century, *i.e.* A.D. 250, in the case of Pope Stephen.

There were two bishops in Spain named Basilides and Martial. These men were deposed from their sees on account of grievous crimes, and Felix and Sabinus were elected in their places. Upon this Basilides appeals to the Roman Bishop, S. Stephen, and by a false statement of the facts of his case induces Stephen to give a favourable opinion concerning him. While, however, Basilides and Martial appeal to Rome, Felix and Sabinus appeal to Carthage, where at that time S. Cyprian was bishop. They brought letters with them from the Churches of Leon, Asturia, and Merida, and from Felix Bishop of Sarragossa. In a council of thirty-six bishops, presided over by S. Cyprian, the case was heard, and S. Cyprian writes a letter in reply in which

he opposes the opinion of S. Stephen, Bishop of Rome. In his letter he says that the ordination of Sabinus was correct, and that hands were laid upon him rightly in the place of Basilides; and he continues—

"Nor can it invalidate a rightful ordination, that Basilides after the detection of his crimes, and the laying bare his conscience by his confession, going to Rome, *deceived our colleague Stephen* (who was far removed, and ignorant of the thing as it was really done), that he might make interest for an unjust restoration to that Episcopate from which he had been rightly deposed. It comes to this, that the crimes of Basilides have been rather doubled than wiped away, since to his former sins, the crime of deceit and falsehood has been added. Nor should he (Stephen) *be so much blamed, who through negligence was overreached*, as the other execrated who fraudulently deceived."*

Now a very little observation will show the value of this fact. There is indeed an appeal on one side to the Bishop of Rome. That may show the *primacy*. But there is also an appeal by the other contending party to Carthage. What does that say as to the *supremacy?* Rome decides one way, Carthage another. S. Stephen on one side, S. Cyprian on the other. S. Stephen pronounces for the restoration of the criminal bishop.

---

* S. Cypr., Ep. lviii.

S. Cyprian gives no heed to this judgment; but pronounces his restoration invalid.

It is very plain then that there was no opinion at that time, prevalent in the Church at large, that the Bishop of Rome, beyond the first apostolic seat, had any power or jurisdiction, or was superior to other bishops.

4. But a stronger and better known case is that which occurred between the same two bishops in the matter of rebaptising heretics. It appears to have been the custom of the Church in Africa to rebaptise such persons as came into the Church, after having been guilty of heresy. S. Stephen, then Bishop of Rome, thought it his duty to expostulate against this custom, and after much controversy, he ended by passing a sentence of excommunication against S. Cyprian for adhering to it. It is quite true that S. Cyprian (as it was afterwards ruled by the Church in a General Council) was wrong. But it had not been so pronounced by the Church at that time; and therefore S. Cyprian gave no heed whatever to what was said by Pope Stephen. S. Firmilian, Bishop of Cæsarea, was joined to S. Cyprian, and these two having heard what the Bishop of Rome had set forth, assembled a council of eighty-seven bishops of Africa. In this council S. Cyprian declared—

"That in respect of the internal government and particular custom of each diocese, there was no

one in the Church of God who could be bishop of bishops, or who could compel them by threats to forsake what they had found established by their predecessors."

And again he says :—

"In which matter we do violence, and give the law to no one, inasmuch as *every bishop has the free choice of his own will in the administration of the Church*, as he will give an account of his acts to the Lord."*

Now the Roman Primacy in its proper sense was always acknowledged by S. Cyprian, as testified in his work "*On the Unity of the Church*," therefore it was not against the primacy that he in any way contended, but only against that supremacy which Pope Stephen had affected in prescribing, as a foreign bishop, what should be the use of the African Churches. This conduct of S. Cyprian was approved afterwards by S. Augustine, who confesses that, had he been in S. Cyprian's case, he would have done the same thing. S. Augustine attributes to a General Council alone, and not to the Bishop of Rome, the settlement of such an affair as that which had drawn forth the censure of Stephen. He says that S. Cyprian would have yielded *if there had been any decree of the Church;* but was justified in not yielding to the mere decree of one bishop; holding that Pope Stephen was but one bishop.

---

* S. Cyprian, Epp. lxxiii. iv. &c.

Now, the question is—Could S. Cyprian, S. Firmilian, and all the other eighty-seven bishops of Africa be ignorant of the claim of the Bishop of Rome to rule the whole Church, if there had been such a claim? Could they be ignorant that the Pope had a right to pronounce of his own mere will, what should be the law of the Church, if there had been such a right? If the Pope's decision on any subject was to be considered final, would they not have known it, and if they had known it would they have thus unanimously disobeyed it? Surely the case seems perfectly clear and beyond doubt, that no such power existed.

5. Paul of Samosata was Bishop of Antioch about the year of our LORD 260. He diverged from the Catholic faith, and propounded doctrines very nearly similar to those now held by Socinians, denying the divinity of our Blessed LORD. At this time S. Cyprian of Carthage had suffered his martyrdom, and Stephen, of whom we spoke last as Bishop of Rome, had also departed to his rest. Dionysius in succession had become Bishop of Rome. Now here was a great and most important event conspicuously before the Church. One of her chief bishops, one who held an Apostolical seat founded by S. Peter himself, was guilty of a deadly heresy. What was done? Did the Church lay the case before Dionysius the Pope? Did the Pope himself interfere and pro-

nounce the Catholic faith, or depose the heretic bishop? By no means. No notice whatever is taken of the Bishop of Rome, but the bishops of the neighbouring sees, *i.e.* of the two Cæsareas, of Pontus, Tarsus, Iconium, Jerusalem, Bostra, and numberless others, with presbyters and deacons, all flock to Antioch to meet in Council. After various questionings and discussions, and many meetings from time to time, the heretical bishop is at last convicted, deposed, and solemnly excommunicated.*

Then, after the manner of the Church in those days, synodical letters are sent to all the other bishops, acquainting them with the result of the Council, and the excommunication of Paul. Among the rest, as the chief bishop of the West, letters are sent to Dionysius of Rome. The decree of the Council is accepted by him, as, indeed, by all the bishops throughout the Catholic world, and acted upon; while Domnus, the new bishop, is elected and consecrated to the see of Antioch.

Now what is the case here? Why, a patriarch of an apostolic see is examined, judged, and deposed, *without the slightest reference to Rome.* The Church of the adjoining provinces of the East, but none of the West, assemble to decide the faith, depose their patriarch, and elect another. Is it possible to think that all this while it was

* Eusebius, lib. vii. c. 28. Conc., tom. p. 185. L. et C.

an established dogma in the Church, that the successor of S. Peter at Rome was the head of the Church, or Vicar of CHRIST, supreme above all other bishops, and that to him alone was committed the guardianship and custody of the faith?

Such an idea is quite impossible. The Church proceeds upon her troubled course, but she proceeds *in herself* throughout the world. There is no thought but that the bishops are one equal brotherhood. There is no thought of one being above another, neither in Rome any more than in Antioch; nor Antioch any more than Ephesus, but, all together form one body in CHRIST their LORD.

6. Melchiades was Bishop of Rome at the commencement of the fourth century. In his time Donatus, a bishop in Numidia, created a schism by setting up a bishop of his own against Cæcilianus, who had been lawfully elected and consecrated to the episcopal office. Donatus appealed against Cæcilian to the Emperor Constantine the Great. The Emperor referred the case to Melchiades, with whom he joined three French bishops, and fifteen bishops from Italy, and, in synod assembled, these heard the case. But the decision being in favour of Cæcilianus, his adversary, Donatus, appealed back again to the Emperor, who then, a second time, assigned other bishops, who met in synod at Arles in France,

A.D. 314. These bishops, meeting from Africa, Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Gaul, and Britain, with two priests and deacons, representing Pope Sylvester, who, in the interval, had succeeded Melchiades, decided a second time in favour of Cæcilianus. But Donatus, still persevering, appeared again before the emperor, and the emperor a third time heard the case himself. The decision, however, of the emperor was precisely the same as before in the councils, and Cæcilianus was pronounced to be in the right.

Now this is a very remarkable history in illustration of what the Church then thought to be the authority of the Pope. For, first, the Pope Melchiades, not by himself, but with other bishops called in to assist him, makes a decision on a case referred to him in the matter of a neighbouring bishopric. But his decision is by no means final, even though joined in a synod with other bishops, but an appeal is directed to the emperor, and the emperor refers it back to a council of Western bishops. It is clear then that neither the emperor nor the Council of Arles thought it at all remarkable that a pope's decision should be set aside. It did not seem to be an unusual thing. A pope's judgment was not, in the opinion of the Church, final. Neither, again, did one pope, succeeding another pope whose decision was impugned, think it at all remarkable that such decision should be impugned; for, without any scruple, he sent his delegates to

attend that very council which was to try, rehear, and rejudge his predecessor's decision. On the one hand, the primacy of S. Peter's chair is defined by the emperor's referring the case to Melchiades. But, on the other, any supremacy is altogether marked as an unknown thing by the appeal from it to the Synod at Arles, and afterwards back again to the emperor himself.*

CHAPTER XIV.

Along a troubled course of three hundred and twenty-five years had the Christian faith advanced, when, for the first time since the Apostolic Council at Jerusalem, the rulers of the Universal Church were gathered together in one. In Provincial Councils they had often met (such as at Arles in the West and Antioch in the East, already mentioned), but the whole Church had never been assembled in one until now. Pressed by the great heresy of Arius, Constantine the Great called her together from the East and from the West, from the North and from the South, in order that once for all might be determined what should be the Catholic Faith.

"From all the Churches," says Eusebius,

* Euseb. lib. x. c. 5. Concil. Labbe et Cossart., tom. i. p. 259, &c.

"which filled Europe, Africa, and Asia, there were collected together the first-fruits of the ministers of GOD. And one house of prayer, as it were enlarged by GOD, contained within it at once Syrians and Cilicians, Phœnicians and Arabians, and those of Palestine; those, moreover, of Egypt, Thebais, and Libya, and those who came from Mesopotamia. A Persian bishop, too, was present, nor was a Scythian wanting. Pontus also, Galatia, Pamphylia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Phrygia, they all sent their chosen ones. The Thracians, Macedonians, Achæans, Epirots, and those who dwelt yet further still. And from Spain came the celebrated Hosius, one sitting with many. *And of the royal city* [Rome] *the bishop was absent from age, but his presbyters being present, filled his place.*"*

This must, indeed, have been a glorious assembly. Since the days of Pentecost nothing like it had been seen, both for the number of the bishops, and from their character, and from their learning. Many were eminent for apostolic gifts, many had worked miracles, most of them were confessors, bearing in the body the marks of the Lord JESUS. James, of Nisibis, had raised the dead to life, and performed many other miracles. Paul, Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, in the persecution of Licinius, had lost the use of his hands—the red-hot iron had destroyed the power

* Eusebius, "De Vita Const." iii. 6, 7.

of motion. Others came in similar manner with loss of hands, with loss of eyes; others hamstrung in the knees, of whom was Paphnutius. A crowd of martyrs gathered in one.*

Thus came the Fathers of the Church, bearing their sufferings for their LORD'S sake, three hundred and eighteen bishops, toiling from long distances, and at great cost both of body and mind, to bear witness to the faith.

It was the great Council of Nicea; that to which the Church, from the moment of its decrees, has ever looked, next to Holy Scripture, as her guide and rule in matters of faith; that to which she owes the great bulwark of her defence against heresy in the two creeds; first, the Nicene creed, and then its development, the Athanasian; that to which she has ever appealed—and which even the greatest and most powerful Bishops of Rome have ever acknowledged to be a sin to contradict or to doubt. Hosius, Bishop of Cordova in Spain, was President, and the principal bishops who guided its deliberations were Eustathius, Patriarch of Antioch, and Alexander, Patriarch of Alexandria; the latter attended by his deacon, the celebrated Athanasius, being then a young man of twenty-seven years. To Athanasius, though so young, is attributed the principal exposition of the arguments by which the Church was guided; and to Hosius is

* Theodoret. Rufinus.

attributed the composition of the creed, which the Council ultimately set forth as defining the terms of the orthodox faith.

But it was not only points of faith which this great Council had to determine. There were several other points involving discipline upon which they were called to adjudicate. They decided the proper time for keeping Easter; that very point in which Victor had failed in the second century; and their decision has remained the law of the Church from that day to the present. They also heard the cause of the Patriarch of Alexandria against Meletius, in the decision of which they made canons, which equally remain the law of the Church, as to the jurisdiction of bishops, to this day.

Thus all things were brought before them, the faith of the Church and the discipline of the Church. They decided summarily and with authority. They spoke as though they were the voice of the Church, moved by the Holy Ghost. "Thus believes the Catholic Church." "Thus it seems good." "Thus we decree."

Now let us consider the two points which are here involved. They embrace the whole essence and being of the Church.

First, in regard of faith. What was it that these holy men, meeting together from the remotest parts of the world, were called on to decide; and how did it arise? Arius, a turbulent and disaffected priest of Alexandria, already put

out of the Church for adhering to a schismatic bishop, had, by degrees, kindled a great heresy. He had taught that—

"GOD the Son was not eternal; that GOD the Father, being Himself unoriginate, had *made* GOD the second Person of the Trinity, and adopted Him to be His Son: that the Son had no character of Divinity in His own Person, not being equal, or consubstantial with the Father; that therefore, though there is a Trinity, yet it is not with an equal glory or Godhead, because the Persons are separate from each other, and one infinitely more glorious than another; that by GOD the Father's will, the Son became wisdom, power, the Spirit, the truth, the word; but that He was not so from the beginning; that the Son therefore is inferior to the Father, it being plain that the originated must be inferior to the unoriginate."*

Such was the dreadful heresy that the Fathers of Nice had to consider and to condemn; and such the poison that from the year 319 had been pervading not one or two dioceses secretly, but numbers of dioceses, and in every quarter, with open effrontery. And this must carefully be observed as bearing on the question of Rome. It was a thing not done in a corner, nor by a few. Letters were passing from bishop to bishop

* These are the very expressions of Arius. See Newman's "Arians of the Fourth Century," p. 234.

concerning it. The Churches in the East were in a body pressing the Patriarch of Alexandria to pass sentence of excommunication. It was, in short, a thing in every one's mouth, as being the grossest blasphemy against Almighty God that the Church had ever witnessed.

And secondly, in regard of discipline. What was it that these holy men were called upon to determine ? The sixth Canon of the Council will lead us to consider what it was. The words run thus :—

"Let the ancient customs, which are in Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis be maintained; namely, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over them all, since *this is customary also with the Bishop of Rome*. In like manner as regards Antioch, and in all other provinces, let the Churches preserve their dignity. This is altogether certain, that if any one become a bishop without the consent of the metropolitan, the great Synod has determined that he ought not to be a bishop."*

But we must know the immediate cause which drew forth this canon. The immediate cause was the conduct of Meletius, a schismatical Bishop of Lycopolis, who took upon himself to ordain other bishops within the province of Alexandria. Now the right thus to ordain bishops was vested, in

* Council of Nice, Can. vi.

the case of Alexandria, in the hands of the *patriarch of the province*. This was the "ancient custom," to which the canon alludes. Accordingly Meletius, for violating the "ancient custom," was deposed by the Council; while, for the sake of the future discipline of the Church, the Fathers grafted upon this particular case a general rule, which was to last for ever; namely, that in every province, each metropolitan, and no other, was to ordain the provincial bishops.

This canon is referred to afterwards as the recognised basis upon which the Church was to act, by the second canon of the Council of Constantinople, which succeeded in the year 381. The Canon of Constantinople states as follows:—

"Let not the bishops go out of their diocese, (patriarchate) to Churches beyond their bounds, nor cause a confusion of Churches; but, according to the canons, let the Bishop of Alexandria order the affairs of Egypt only, the Bishops of the East, the East only, saving the dignity of the Church of Antioch, *expressed in the Canons of Nice*.

"Let not the bishops go out of their diocese for ordination, or any other ecclesiastical office; but observing the above-written canon concerning dioceses, it is clear that the synod of each province will manage the affairs of the province, according to the decrees of Nice."*

* Conc. Constant., Canon ii.

Now this sixth Canon of Nice, echoed by the second Canon of Constantinople, has a most important bearing upon the position of Rome, which the reader must not pass by. Consider the case. Here was a bishop in one of the provinces of the patriarchate of Alexandria taking upon himself to ordain and consecrate bishops, and, upon being rebuked, not only refusing to cease his unauthorised practices, but continuing in open schism to violate and destroy all constituted authority. It is brought before the Council. The Council hears the case, adjudicates concerning it, and makes its decree. But observe —it speaks not only concerning the individual case, but promulgates a law for the Church Universal, which law was afterwards acknowledged to be binding by the same Universal Church, *the bishopric of Rome included*. What we learn from the canon then, is this: That the Bishop of Rome had his patriarchal power just the same, and no otherwise than the other patriarchates. The canon states that the Bishop of Alexandria is to have power over Egypt, Libya, and Pentapolis, because those regions were within his jurisdiction by the "*ancient customs*." And it gives us as a reason for that judgment, the fact, "so it is customary with the Bishop of Rome." *What* is customary with the Bishop of Rome? Why to rule over and ordain in those places which are subject to Rome by the ancient customs, but no others.

In other words. As the Roman Bishop, a thing well known to all, has limits to his patriarchate prescribed by custom; but in those prescribed limits he exercises full and plenary authority, and is not interfered with by other bishops; so let it be with the Alexandrian patriarch. He is to exercise his jurisdiction over the provinces which are ceded to him by custom; and is not to be interfered with by other bishops.

These exceptions, however, being established on account of the ancient customs, we decree that in all other cases each metropolitan is to ordain and rule in his own province.

Most undoubtedly there is a kind of primacy or superiority involved in this exception which is made for Rome. The Patriarch or Pope of Rome *did*, it is confessed, at that time exercise certain privileges; that is, of ordaining and presiding in other provinces, and thereby setting aside the metropolitans who ruled in those provinces. But the very same privileges are now by this canon to be conferred on the Patriarch or Pope of Alexandria. Whatever primacy then was acknowledged for the one is now conferred upon the other. What then becomes of the supremacy of Rome? We look abroad from the Fathers of Nicea upon the aspect of the Church East and West, and what do we behold? While we are reading this canon two great truths, from which we cannot escape, are forced upon us. One, that the notion prevailing in the Church at

large concerning the power and jurisdiction of bishops is simply *equality;* the other, that, as an historical fact of that age, the Church of Rome did not extend in jurisdiction beyond certain limits. The Fathers of Nicea had to make a law for the government of a vast territory of the Eastern Church. They made this law on similar and equal grounds to those which they observed to prevail in the West; they conceded precisely the same privileges to Alexandria as to Rome. They did not look upon the See of Rome as containing anything within it at all peculiar as of divine right; they had no idea they were meddling with any extraordinary jurisdiction which the See of S. Peter had received from God; but they cited it in common and ordinary language as containing within it an "ancient custom" by which they thought it fair and equitable to be guided, and upon this they made an universal canon.

Again, as to the historical fact that the Church of Rome did not extend in jurisdiction beyond certain limits. There were, indeed, many suburbican provinces and bishoprics attached to Rome, but those did not even extend over the whole of Italy. It was a jurisdiction well known and defined, and shown so to be by this very canon. Its limits were marked. If so, what becomes of that *Universal Bishopric* which is the claim of the Romanists of the present day? There may, indeed, have been, and there was, a

certain character of reverence, as also of dignity, attached to the See of Rome. Its primacy, as S. Peter's seat, all did, all ever will, acknowledge; but there it rests. We cannot controvert such a plain fact as is here set before us, namely, that the boundaries of Rome were as clearly defined as a Patriarchal Church, as the boundaries of Alexandria or of Antioch.

These, however, are arguments derived from a specific consideration of the words of the Council *after it had met*. A greater and a more general argument may be derived from the simple question, *Why did the Council meet at all?*

How was it so directed in the providence of Almighty God, that the very time the great heresy of Arius threatened the destruction of Christianity, there was such concentration of political power in the hands of one great emperor, that, through him, the Church was enabled to gather herself together? And how was it so directed by the same gracious providence that the mind of this great emperor, though still heathen, was nevertheless so moved towards Christianity that he perceived in it some great strength and virtue which was needed by him in the advancement of his political plans? And how, thereupon, was it that, seizing the opportunity which was given him by the state of the world at that precise moment, he resorted to such a plan as this; namely, to call together from the ends of the world the bishops and

chief rulers of every Church? Such a thing had never happened before, for such a combination of events had never before arisen. This surely must be received as a manifestation of God's directing hand in preserving the Church.

But the theory of the Romanists is, that to the Bishop of Rome, as successor of S. Peter, is committed the guardianship of the Church. To him, with plenary power over all bishops, is given by divine right, and has been given from the beginning of the Church, vicarial rights, even of our Blessed Lord Himself. The Pope has infallible knowledge so as to be aware of every fact, and supreme power so as to be able to guide, direct, and decide what should be done in every controversy and difficulty of the Church. *Then* it is a very simple question, which even a child may put, "*What need of the Council of Nicea?*"

Here was the heresy of Arius burning within the Church. The Bishop of Rome remains quiescent in his see, and says nothing. Here was the peace of the world disturbed, and scandal thrown upon the very profession of Christ. A heathen, to whom disputes on this subject must of course have been of no consequence, yet puts forth all his energy to allay them. And what does he? Apply to the Bishop of Rome? Not in the least. He writes both to Alexander and to Arius, the two disputants; but takes no notice of the Bishop of Rome. Something must be

done by the Church, especially by that part of it where the immediate danger lay, or otherwise the Church will be lost. Is it to the Bishop of Rome that application is made by the Church to pronounce what the faith is, so as to preserve it? Not in the least. Constantine does write, but he writes to no one particular bishop as though power lay with him to defend the faith, but he writes a circular letter to all the bishops throughout the world, and imputes to their collective decision the only chance that seemed to remain, of restoring unity of faith among the disputants. "*These things being so*," he says, "*receive ye gladly the grace of God, and, as it truly is, the divine command. For whatsoever is done in the holy council of bishops is to be referred to the divine will.*" * Moreover, the Council assembles. They choose their president. Pope Sylvester is too aged even to attend. It is of no consequence. They pass him by. Two priests represent him, but they take no such leading part as Athanasius the deacon, the attendant of Alexander, did. Hosius, a Spaniard, presides. Athanasius, a Greek, bears the brunt of the controversy, and the Creed is drawn up by Hosius; that Creed which is to be the guide of Christians for ever. Does all this agree with the dogma of Papal supremacy? Does it seem as though there was a well-known divine right, and established throughout

* Euseb. iii. 20.

the world, that at Rome there lay the only sure defence of CHRIST'S holy Church, and in her bishop the supreme authority from which all must spring?

It needs but little more than common sense to answer such a question.

Great indeed and never ending ought to be the thanks of all Christian men for the Council of Nicea. As a point of history in the Church, as a crisis in the battle of truth against the enemy of souls, that great Antichrist, which, in the person of Arius, denied the divine nature of the Lord JESUS, it has ever been held in the highest veneration and honour. The rule of faith, as well as the rule of discipline, is first embodied here. It is that authority to which all refer, and all submit. This is not said by us as mere opponents to Rome, but it is said by herself, and even put forth by her greatest and chiefest divines of the purer ages. To take one instance, that of Pope Leo the Great (A.D. 440), no inconsiderable inheritor of the Papal chair. Over and over again he cites the Nicene Council; over and over again he exhorts obedience to its decrees, he claims that nothing should be done without it. To infringe it would be madness, to believe contrary to it would be heresy.

"Those holy and venerable Fathers, who after condemning, together with his impiety, the sacrilegious Arius, passed in the city of Nicea *ecclesiastical canons, which are to last even to the end of*

the world. These Fathers live in their appointments, both with us, and through the whole world; and if any encroachment be made any where contrary to their determination it is immediately annulled; in order that the general arrangements made for perpetual use be varied by no change; nor things for the common advantage be drawn to private interest; and that by the maintenance of those limits which the Fathers have appointed, no one may intrude on another's right, but each, according to his ability, spread himself forth in charity within his proper and legitimate boundaries."*

And again he uses such expressions as these:—

"As to the maintenance of the statutes of the holy Fathers, which were fixed at the Synod of Nicea, I remind you, *that the rights of Churches as they were ordered by those three hundred and eighteen Fathers through divine inspiration, may continue.*"†

We need not add to this, but only to say that for ever after, whatever controversies arose, whatever disputes, whatever subsequent councils; all reference is made, as to a divine authority, to Nicea. Subsequent councils, whatever difficulties they had to settle, began their discussions by reciting the canons and faith of Nicea. If any wished to show that his adversary was guilty of heresy, he would try him by Nicea. If any would assert his orthodoxy or his rights, he would prove it by

* S. Leo, Ep. cvi. † Ibid. cxiv. c. 2.

agreeing with Nicea. Indeed it was quite wonderful to see, and nothing could have caused it, but the especial direction of the Holy Spirit; how universal and all-abiding has been the effect and authority of this great Council upon the whole Church, still abiding to this day.

CHAPTER XV.

The contest between the heretical Arians and the true members of the Church by no means terminated with the Council of Nicea. On the contrary, the Arians by every means within their reach—by fraud, by violence, by gaining the ear of the Emperor, and by filling the principal sees with their own creatures, continued for many years to perpetuate their most odious heresy.

It is not our object here to relate these unfortunate controversies, disgraceful in every way to the history of the Church, but only so far to refer to them as they bring before us one great mover in them, who was the Bishop of Rome. This it is necessary to do in connection with that of events which bear on the Papal Supremacy.

On the death of Pope Julius, a bishop who had been conspicuously faithful in his defence of S. Athanasius, the Roman Church selected Liberius as his successor, A.D. 352. At first, Liberius followed the example of his predecessor, and when Constantius, then

Emperor, convoked a Council at Arles, he sent legates to that Council with instructions to defend S. Athanasius. But the legates of the Pope actually subscribed the condemnation of the man whom they were sent to defend. It does not appear that Liberius was in any way party to this, although, even at the commencement, there were signs of a doubtful mind. As far, however, as outward acts were concerned, he maintained communion with S. Athanasius until the year 355; for in that year, in consequence of his refusing to obey the Emperor, who had taken the Arian side, he was expelled from Rome, and banished to Bercœa in Thrace. It was evidently the policy of Constantius to wear out and subdue the bishops who still remained orthodox, and to compel them, either by fair means or foul, to embrace the Arian side. In this policy he proceeded so far, that at a Council which met at Milan, where the orthodox bishops made a stand, and refused to compromise the faith, alleging that there was no ecclesiastical canon that could compel their subscription, the Emperor said: "*Whatever I will, let that be esteemed a canon. Either then obey or go into banishment.*"* They had therefore no choice. Either they must subscribe against Athanasius and hold communion with the Arians because the Emperor willed it, or they must give up their Churches and depart. Thus every city, we are

* S. Athan: "Hist. Arian." § 76, p. 287.

told by those who record these times, was full of fear and confusion, while the bishops were dragged along to trial, and the magistrates witnessed the lamentations and groans of the people. It is not then to be wondered at, that under these grievous tribulations many should fall. The heresy was disguised and modified. It was shaped into an infinity of various creeds, so that some were ignorantly deceived. Upon many, violence even to blows and torture were used to compel their signature. The aged Hosius—even Hosius the President of the Council of Nicea, now a hundred years old—was thus put to torture; and, alas, truth must record that he gave way, and signed the fatal blasphemy. He died however shortly after, recanting what he had done and again embracing the faith of Athanasius.

Thus miserable, thus utterly perplexed, as our Lord had prophesied, thus brought before rulers and kings, even from among themselves, and by their own unhappy differences, was the suffering Church of Christ. A lesson surely it was; a bitter lesson and punishment in having in the original case of Constantine placed herself under his protection as a civil ruler; and so making that amalgamation of Church and State, which seems ever to end in the loss or compromise of Truth.

But in all this, what of Liberius, the Bishop of Rome? If Hosius fell, even the saintly Hosius, we shall not be surprised to hear that

Liberius, who seems all along to have been of a worldly and time-serving spirit, should follow his example. He had indeed so far witnessed a good confession in suffering his banishment; but the tide, under persecution now running so sharply, and being constantly in fear of threatened death, he at last gave way. He now takes a different side. He writes to the Arians as "his most beloved brethren the presbyters and fellow bishops of the East." He apologizes for having ever defended S. Athanasius, and says that he only did so on the ground of his predecessor Julius.

"So then," he writes," "Athanasius being removed from the communion of us all, so that I am not to receive even his letters, I say that I am quite at peace and concord with you all, and with the Eastern bishops in all the provinces. But that ye may know that in this letter I speak in true faith, know that I say the same as my common lord and brother Demophilus said, in expounding your catholic faith: 'This I have taken up with a willing mind; I contradict it in nothing; I have given it my consent; I follow it; it is held by me.'"

Such is the letter, recorded by S. Hilary of Poictiers. He, a true confessor, in his indignation at the words of this letter, bursts out in interruption while he writes it: "This is Arian blasphemy." "This *I* record, not the apostate." "Anathema I say to thee Liberius and thy com-

panions." "Again, and a third time, Anathema to thee, Prevaricator Liberius." *

Upon this, and further assurances that Liberius had now completely become an Arian, the Emperor granted him permission to return to Rome. The bishops at Sirmium, who were in the Emperor's confidence, wrote to Felix, who in the meantime had been elected to the See, and desired him to receive him back as a brother; *and that both should govern the Apostolic See, exercising the office of Pope in common.*

This surely is sufficient for the case of the unhappy Liberius. The theory of Papal Supremacy is, that the Pope cannot err; that he is by office endued with power not only to know the truth, but to preserve it; and that not only in himself, but through all the Church. All the Popes down to this period had at least maintained the orthodox faith. The Creed of Nicea had ever met, at least in Rome, with full and complete acceptance.

But what are we to say now? Could the Arian Liberius, the prevaricator, the betrayer of his high office for fear of rulers and kings, be the "Vicar of Christ?" Could that bishop whom S. Hilary anathematized, ("Anathema tibi Liberi,") brought back to his See under the protection of the civil power, *upon condition of professing heresy*, be rightly designated as the repre-

* S. Hilar. Pictav. Fragm. vi.

sentative of that Lord Whom by his very heresy he was denying? Surely this was not the charge with which S. Peter was commissioned in the divine office given by our Lord, "*Feed My sheep.*" If not, how could Liberius be holding S. Peter's place?

During the reigns of the Emperors Gratian and Theodosius, (A.D. 367 to 395,) it seemed as though the orthodox faith might once more be established in the Church. But though, at this period, Arianism in the open and direct form of its original appearance might be said to be declining, it still shed forth various branches and offshoots whose fruits were continually irritating and distracting the minds of men. And this, not only in its own many subdivisions, but in the agitation of controversy to which it led.

It is the tendency of every great heresy in the very act of raising up defenders of truth, to propagate error on the opposite side of the heresy which is denounced. Thus, while combating Arianism, in the very eagerness with which men sought to avoid the denial of the divinity of our Lord, they, in many cases, fell into the opposite extreme, and were found to impugn the doctrine of His humanity.

Apollinaris, Bishop of Laodicea, maintained that the Body of Christ was assumed, that it was endowed with a sensitive, but not a rational soul.

Marcellus, about the same time, Bishop of Ancyra, considered that the Son and the Holy Ghost were merely two emanations from the divine nature, which, after performing their respective offices, would disappear, and return to the substance of the Father.

Photinus, Bishop of Sirmium, maintained that JESUS CHRIST being born of the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, a divine emanation descended *afterwards* from Heaven and united the Divine Word with human nature. He maintained also that the Holy Ghost was not a distinct Person, but a celestial virtue proceeding from the Deity.

Macedonius, Bishop of Constantinople, carried forward the idea of Photinus still further, and with greater distinctness. He taught that the Holy Ghost was nothing but a divine energy, diffused throughout the universe, and not a Person distinct from the Father and the Son.

But in order to give the reader some notion of the state of the Church in the unhappy period succeeding the Nicene Council, it will be well to rest succinctly upon the two Dioceses of Constantinople and of Antioch. It is in the history of these two Sees, terminating in the second General Council of Constantinople, that we shall find the most important answer to the question, what in these ages was the authority of Rome?

First then as to Constantinople. Macedonius, as just mentioned, was found in possession of

the See, A.D. 342, placed there by the Arians, in opposition to the orthodox Paul. He entered upon the government of the Church in the midst of violence and bloodshed, and continued it in the propagation of his heresy with such scenes of brutal violence, as would rather befit a heathen tyrant than a Christian bishop. Confiscation of property, banishment, torture, and death, were the means by which he accomplished outward conformity with a doctrine which asserted the Holy Ghost to be a creature. Women and children were baptised into this faith by compulsion, and the holy Eucharist was forced by instruments down the throats of those who were unwilling otherwise to receive it. At length, in the year 360, this impious man was deposed from his See; still, however, in exile, continuing to propagate his heresy. Then there came a little rest; and S. Gregory of Nazianzum was elected to the See. How great a contrast! A man of the humblest spirit, the deepest piety, and the purest mind. But this not long; for Maximus, one who was actually baptised by Gregory himself, treated with the greatest affection, and admitted by him to holy orders, rises up against him, and usurps his place. He conducts an intrigue with some of the principal presbyters, gains over Peter, Patriarch of Alexandria, induces the presence of three bishops, and then breaking into the Metropolitan Church during the night, instals himself, with this aid,

in the episcopal throne. A tumult ensues, and he is obliged to fly. But not the least daunted, he appeals to a Council of the West, and the Council, deceived by his representations, approves his consecration. He is afterwards, however, expelled in the midst of tumult and confusion, and the vacant See awaits once more the return of order in the second General Council. That Council with unanimous consent (as long as the Alexandrian bishops were absent), restored S. Gregory of Nazianzum. Unwillingly, however, he succeeds; unwillingly he bears his share once more in the tumultuous eminence of that day of contest; and for a short time again rules that long misgoverned people.

But the Alexandrian bishops arriving at the Council, object to S. Gregory's election, on the ground that it was contrary to the canons to translate a bishop from one see to another. This allowed S. Gregory the opportunity he had so long desired, of resigning the See into which he had in good truth been driven so much against his will. Nectarius was elected in his place, and S. Gregory retired to private life.

2. We must now consider the state of the second See, that of Antioch. It was no happier than that of Constantinople. Eudoxius had been translated from the former to the latter; upon which Meletius was elected to fill his place. Meletius had been brought up among the Arians, and consecrated by them to Sebaste, and now, as

a representative of the Arians, he was placed in Antioch. On the new Patriarch's arrival at Antioch, A.D. 261, he was escorted by the court, and his own suffragan bishops, with great ceremony to the cathedral. The Emperor himself was present. While all were expecting a discourse, if not abounding, at least sufficiently impregnated with the Arian or semi-Arian opinions as to be satisfactory to their party; lo! to the astonishment of all, the new Patriarch made confession of the orthodox faith, the faith of Nicea. The great multitude of the assembled people received his discourse with shouts of triumph, upon which the Arian archdeacon ran up and forcibly placed his hand upon the mouth of the Patriarch to prevent him speaking. Upon this Meletius stretched out his hand, first raising his three fingers, and then one, thus symbolizing the Trinity in Unity. But the consequence was as might have been expected, Meletius was banished, and a new prelate elected.

Time went on, and with the changed influence of the court, the Arian emperors having ceased to reign, Meletius was restored. Now, however, a fresh difficulty sprang up. The Emperor had restored him, and the Council of Alexandria was summoned to consider his case. But, in the interval, another party had started forth, not considering Meletius rightly consecrated, by reason of his former Arianism. This party chose one Paulinus for their bishop, and procured his

consecration by the hands of Lucifer, a Latin bishop in the interest of Rome. So it came to pass that Antioch was now divided between two orthodox bishops, the only difference being that the one was governing a portion of the people in communion with the East, the other governing in communion with Alexandria and with Rome. For so it was, that while Meletius was in reality orthodox, having over and over again suffered for that orthodoxy, still the Athanasian party at Alexandria, and specially the Church at Rome, advocated the side of Paulinus.

Time went on. Meletius kept his portion of the See. Paulinus kept his portion. It was attempted for some time unsuccessfully to make a compromise so that both should rule in communion with each other, until the death of either, the survivor in that event becoming the sole bishop. Paulinus, however, did not agree to this, and for a long time Antioch suffered the misfortune of a schism between two bishops, both in reality orthodox, and both, as far as we can learn, desirous of the peace and unity of the Church. Then came the Œcumenical Council of Constantinople, summoned by Theodosius, in which at the commencement S. Meletius himself presided, but in the midst of which, failing in health, and worn out with age and with care, it pleased God to take him to his rest.

Happy would it have been if the Church of Antioch, receiving this as from God, had healed

this unhappy schism by submitting herself to the single government of Paulinus, the survivor. But it was not so. The reader will observe that Paulinus was in the interest of Rome, while Meletius was looked upon by the West with suspicion. The party which had advocated Meletius through jealousy of Rome, refused obedience to Paulinus. They would not have him for their bishop, but proceeded to elect Flavian as the successor of Meletius in the See of Antioch. Thus through mere hatred of Rome the schism was still propagated both during and after the Council of Constantinople.

In this position then stood the parties, adverse to each other and to peace, throughout the Eastern Church in the middle of the fourth century. It is necessary that the reader should observe all this with an attentive spirit, for these events are all connecting links, displaying the position of the Church within herself, and showing how the East stood in connection with the West. It speaks of heresy, tumult, disorder, separation. Both S. Basil the Great and S. Gregory of Nazianzum speak of these times with the greatest sorrow, and in terms almost of despair for the safety of the Church S. Basil says:—

"The danger is not confined to one Church . . . . . Almost from the borders of Illyricum down to the Thebais, the evil of heresy spreads itself. The doctrines of godliness are overturned; the

rules of the Church are in confusion; the ambition of the unprincipled seizes upon places of authority, and the chief seat is now openly proposed as a reward for impiety; so that he whose blasphemies are the most shocking is the more eligible for the oversight of the people. Priestly gravity has perished. There are none left to feed the LORD'S flock with knowledge. Ambitious men are spending in purposes of self-indulgence and bribery, possessions which they hold in trust for the poor. The accurate observance of the canons is no more. There is no restraint upon sin." *

It was time, then, that the voice of some authority should speak. It was time for some decisive act on the part of the Church to clear away these clouds, and to bring peace to disordered Christendom. More particularly it was time that some voice should defend the faith, in regard of the miserable heresy of Macedonius, which was now polluting the Church, second only in malignity of that of Arius.

Theodosius was not backward. The Church called a second General Council, and the Emperor heard the call. In the year 381, one hundred and fifty bishops met together at Constantinople. It was presided over at first by that great and good bishop of whom we have spoken,

* S. Basil, Ep. xciii.

Meletius, Patriarch of Antioch; after his death, by S. Gregory of Nazianzum, and lastly by Nectarius. The object of the Council was, 1. To confirm the faith of Nicea, shaken by the heresy of Macedonius; 2. To elect a canonical bishop for Constantinople in the place of the usurper Maximus; and 3. To make canons of discipline for the Church's better government.

The second of these points was soon disposed of; Maximus, as before related, being pronounced no bishop, was deposed therefore and expelled, and S. Gregory elected in his stead.

Then came the first and more material point—the confirmation of the Creed of Nicea. The Fathers without any difficulty or difference of opinion made such additions as the heresies which had intervened since the Council of Nicea so plainly demanded. These additions were as follow:—

First, in regard of the Incarnation, the Nicene Creed had merely said:—

"He came down from Heaven, was Incarnate, and made Man; suffered and rose again the third day, and ascended into Heaven; and shall come to judge the quick and the dead."

But now the Creed of Constantinople added this:

"Who came down from Heaven, *and was Incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary*, and was made Man. *He was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate;* He suffered *and was buried*,

and He rose again the third day *according to the Scriptures*. He ascended into Heaven. *He sitteth on the right hand of the Father*, and He shall come again *with glory* to judge both the quick and the dead. *Whose Kingdom shall have no end.*"

In regard to the Holy Ghost, the Nicene Creed had merely said :—

"We believe also in the Holy Ghost."

There was no mention of any attribute of the Holy Ghost marking His Divinity, nor any mention of the Church. The Creed of Constantinople adds as follows :—

"We believe likewise in the Holy Ghost, *the Lord and Giver of life, Who proceedeth from the Father, Who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified: Who spake by the prophets; We believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. We acknowledge one Baptism for the remission of sins. We look for the Resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.*"

Now these additions to the creed are highly important. They are highly important as to doctrine. They are highly important as displaying the authority of the Council which dictated them. For it is this very creed, not the Nicene, but the Constantinopolitan under the name of Nicene, which has been recited in the celebration of the Blessed Sacrament from that time unto the present, in every Catholic Church throughout the world.

Now let us take a summary of the chief points involved in the preceding sketch, and what do we observe?

1. First and chiefest, we observe a great Œcumenical Council, assembled to deliberate on the circumstances of the Church, *without any reference to the Bishop of Rome; his opinion concerning it not asked; his presence not invited.*

2. We observe, that had this omission of paying deference to the Bishop of Rome been a vital matter in regard of the canonical authority of the Council, there would have been time for him to notice it, and the Church generally of the West would have so noticed it. But so far from noticing it as a thing at all vitiating the authority of the Council, the Bishop of Rome and his successors for ever have received it as Œcumenical, and it is now acted upon as Œcumenical by the whole Church throughout the world.

3. We observe that this Council makes many most important additions to the creed, which additions are received as genuine and true by the Bishops of Rome, and incorporated into their liturgy as the groundwork of faith; and from the Bishops of Rome they are transmitted as an heir-loom to the Church for ever.

4. We observe that the president of this Coun-

cil, as long as he lived, was S. Meletius, a bishop hostile to and unrecognised by Rome; succeeded by S. Gregory, placed in the See of Constantinople at the instigation of Meletius; and lastly by Nectarius, elected by the bishops present. So that in no one case was the voice of Rome at all heeded in the constitution of this Council, but rather disregarded.

5. We observe that Maximus, the usurping Bishop of Constantinople, after he had appealed to the West and was approved, evidently in the interest of Rome, was quietly and authoritatively deposed by the Council, as of its own inherent right, and without the slightest reference to Rome.

6. We observe that when S. Meletius died, and it seemed possible that the schism in Antioch might be stayed, this Council, rather than give heed to Paulinus the rival bishop in the interest of Rome, perpetuates the schism, and elects Flavian, acknowledging him only to be Patriarch of Antioch in opposition to Rome.

Now does all this look as though by divine right there had always been from S. Peter's time a bishop at Rome endued with apostolic powers, who had been appointed by CHRIST His own personal representative? Does it seem as if the Church generally at the end of the fourth century, knew and embraced the idea that there was

one great universal Bishop in the West, to whom all the Church was confined, and that he alone was charged with the direction of its faith ?

Rather does not common reason suggest, that there is a very remarkable character about this second General Council, and that it speaks almost with the voice of God in testimony *against that particular kind of Supremacy which the Romanists assert ?*

Yes: it seems to say this: The Church governs herself, makes her own discipline, and regulates her own faith irrespectively of Rome. She can speak, rule, and act as though Rome had no existence whatever. Nay more. She can, in the midst of trouble, and surrounded by heresy, gather herself together, and by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, dictate what the faith of the Church shall be, so that Rome herself, no less than the other Churches, shall receive the faith at her hands ; and all this she can do although Rome, either by her bishop or by his representatives, take no part in the Councils which decree it. Dwell on this. Every time that in the sacred mysteries the priests of the Church recite the Creed of Constantinople, they recite a testimony of God, that the Supremacy of the Church of His Blessed Son is not in the Bishop of Rome, but solely in an Œcumenical Council.

CHAPTER XVI.

In the year 418 took place the sixth Council of Carthage. More than two hundred bishops assembled at it; among whom were Aurelius, Patriarch of Africa, Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, and above all, one whose name is celebrated in all the Churches, the great Augustine, Bishop of Hippo.

Following the "ancient customs" mentioned in the Council of Nicea, and confirmed at the Council of Constantinople, it had ever been a rule in the African Church, that priests, deacons, or other inferior clergy, if they had need to appeal in any cause, should only appeal from their own bishops to the African Synods, and from them to the metropolitans of their province.

Zosimus was Bishop of Rome at this time, and to this Council at Carthage he sent legates to demand that, *according to the Council at Nicea*, the African clergy might be permitted to appeal to *him*, as Bishop of Rome. Now the African Church, as every other Church, were in possession of the Canons of Nicea, but they could find no such canon as that to which Pope Zosimus alluded. Alypius, Bishop of Tagaste, said: "Concerning this matter, we declare that we will observe whatever was enacted by the Council of Nicea; but as yet, this disturbs me, but when

we look into the copies of the Nicene Council we find there nothing like these things."* S. Augustine said: "We will observe this, reserving to ourselves the right of making a more exact search into the acts of the Nicene Synod."

Upon this, having sent to Constantinople and finding no such canon as was alleged by Pope Zosimus, (for he had mistaken another Council, that of Sardica, for Nicea) the African Church at once considered themselves exempt from any such claim as the Pope had attempted to place upon them. Meanwhile, Celestine had succeeded to the papal chair at Rome, and therefore to Celestine the African Fathers indited the following synodical epistle:—

"Let your Holiness, as it becomes you, reject the shameful appeals of litigious priests and clerks: since by no definition of the Fathers is this right of the African Church taken away. The Nicene decrees have most plainly subjected both the inferior order of clergy, and the bishops themselves, to their metropolitans; for they have most prudently and with justice provided that every affair should be terminated in the place where it arose. Nor will the Grace of the Holy Spirit be wanting to any Province; for it is especially granted to every one, (if he is not satisfied with the judgment of those who have

* Justel, p. 142; quoted in the Tentativa by Pereira, p. 115.

taken cognizance of his case,) to appeal to the Synod of his Province, or even to a Universal Council."*

Upon all this Bossuet, defending the Gallican Church in a similar case, makes this remark:—

"Two things we observe; first that the Pope Zosimus when he claimed for his See the appeals of the African Church, brought forward the Canons of Nicea, as received in Africa as well as the whole world; secondly, that the African Fathers openly professed that they would agree to those appeals, if they were commanded by the Canons of Nicea. Therefore neither Pope Zosimus acted by his own mere absolute will, nor did the African Fathers permit him to be ruled by it; but each party referred all the force of their arguments to the receipt of the Canons. . . . . When it appeared that the Canons upheld on the good faith of Zosimus were not Nicene Canons, the whole Council being collected together, they wrote that noble letter to S. Celestine, successor of Zosimus after Boniface, in which they repudiate these new claims (of the Pope) as not proved by the Canons, and so abide by the ancient law."†

Now what are we to conclude from this? The Roman theory is, as distinct from the Catholic,

* Tentativa, p. 117. Codex Canon. Eccl. Africanæ, Labbe et Cossart, tom i. p. 942, &c.

† Bossuet. Def. Cler. Gall. lib: xi. c. 14. Cod. Canon Eccles. Africanæ. Labb et Coss. tom i. p. 950.

that the Pope is the universal bishop, and always was so by Divine right; that he is not only ruler over his own Patriarchate, which embraces the Churches bordering upon the city of Rome, but that he is also Ruler, Director, and Governor over all the Churches throughout the world; that all Churches are to submit their affairs to him, that he is sole judge and arbiter in all their causes, and that his voice must be consulted and heard in every regulation of discipline that may arise for settlement. What then are we to say of the conduct of these African Fathers? It is surely very clear, supposing that such good and holy men as we see to have taken part in this Council, specially the holy Augustine, would not have been wilfully rebellious against him who was (as asserted) set over them in the LORD as their "Vicar of CHRIST." On the contrary, we see by their patient and gentle conduct, in waiting to search the Canons of Nicea which had been wrongly cited by Pope Zosimus, that they would gladly have obeyed him if they could. They displayed no anger or haste, but calmly and dispassionately came to their conclusion.

And what was that conclusion? That the Pope, as holding the See of Rome, had no jurisdiction whatever over them; that the very Nicene Canons to which he had wrongly referred gave the Rule of the Churches in each province to the Metropolitan of that province, without any reference to Rome; and that the Pope in urging the

demand which he had made was guilty of an unjust aggression.

Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, about the year 430, was guilty of a great heresy. It arose out of the many conflicts of opinion which agitated the Church on the subject of the divine nature of our Blessed LORD. The peculiarity of his teaching may best be given in the words of Tillemont.

"The heresy of the Apollinarians, which had commenced about the year 370, held that JESUS CHRIST had no other soul, and no other reason than the Divine Word which was in Him, that this Word had been changed to make one only nature with the body, and that He suffered the death of the Cross even in His divine nature. As this heresy had principally infected the Church of Antioch and Syria, the faithful of those parts applied themselves more particularly to combat it. Thence it is that they appear more than others to have searched out those expressions which distinguished the human nature and the divine nature in JESUS CHRIST; and that they avoided on the contrary, those that might make for too close a union.

"And as it is very difficult to keep an exact mean in truths which are raised so much above the knowledge of men, one must not be surprised if some of the Easterns in wishing to distinguish between the two natures of JESUS CHRIST, have

appeared to separate them, or have effectually separated them.

"It is into this last evil, that Nestorius fell. He insisted so much that God and man were two natures in Jesus Christ, that he would have it that Jesus Christ was not, in truth, other than purely a man, united to the Word, and much more filled with the Divine virtue than all the other saints. From whence it follows that the Word was united with man, *but had not become man*, was not born of the Virgin, and was not dead, and that the Virgin was not the 'Mother of God,' but mother of man, or, as he called her, Mother of Christ, desiring that this word Christ should mark not a man-God, but a man united to God."*

Celestine was at this time Bishop of Rome; S. Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria. Very soon all the three Patriarchs are found in correspondence with each other; those of Rome and Alexandria charging the third of Constantinople with grievous heresy. S. Cyril writes to S. Celestine, and tells him that he has abstained from communion with Nestorius, and asks his co-operation in condemning him. S. Celestine agrees to this, and gives his judgment that Nestorius should be deprived of the Episcopate and expelled from communion of the Church, unless within ten days from the receipt of the sentence he should withdraw all publication of his heresy. He writes

* Tillemont, Mem., tom. xiv. p. 368.

in the same manner to all the other principal bishops, and they all agree. It is a clear sentence in which each individual bishop agrees with and confirms the judgment of the Bishop of Rome standing first in the Primacy of the Church.

Perhaps in ordinary times, and with an ordinary man, this would have been sufficient, and we should have found Nestorius quietly yielding to this expressed opinion of the bishops. But Nestorius was Patriarch of the Royal City, and possessed no small influence with the Emperor; he was an able man, and drew many over to his side by his writing and preaching; sophistically explaining away the evil parts of his heresy, and seducing even many bishops to his side. The minds of men fluctuated, and the whole Empire of the East was divided. Petitions came pouring in from those who were under the jurisdiction of Nestorius, supplicating for a council, "by the presence of which CHRIST should unite the most holy Church, and restore to their place the priests who preached the pure faith. They desired some judgment which might consolidate and restore what was tottering and even overthrown."*

The Emperor, though taking the side of Nestorius, was thus obliged to give way, and at last writes to S. Cyril to appoint a General Council. His words are these: "It is our will that the

* Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. i. p. 1339.

holy doctrine be discussed and examined in a sacred synod, and that sentence be ratified, which appeareth agreeable to the right faith; whether they who shall be pronounced wrong may obtain pardon from the Fathers or not."* Upon which Bossuet remarks: "Here we see three things:—

"1. That after the judgment of Celestine another is still required, that of a Council.

"2. That these two things would rest with the Fathers; namely, to judge of doctrine, and of persons.

"3. That the judgment of the Council would be final."†

The Council met at Ephesus, and two hundred bishops were present. First the letter of S. Cyril to Nestorius was read, examined, and approved; agreeing with what P. Celestine had said, and which had been published to all the Churches. Next the letter of Nestorius was produced which Celestine had pronounced heretical. It was examined and condemned. Next the letter of Celestine to Cyril was read, in which he gave sentence against Nestorius. Next inquiry was made whether Nestorius had been made aware of the sentence of Celestine, and whether

* Ep. Theod. ad Cyr. Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. i. p. 1341.

† Bossuet, Def. Cler. Gal., lib. viii. c. 10.

after the appointed days had elapsed he still remained in his opinion. All being thus examined, the Council pronounces judgment in these words:—

"Since the most impious Nestorius has neither been willing to obey our citation, nor to admit the bishops deputed by us, we have necessarily proceeded to the examination of what he has impiously taught. Finding therefore, partly from his own letters, partly from his discourses, that he holds and preaches impiety;—compelled by the holy Canons, and by the letters of the most holy Father and fellow minister Celestine, Bishop of the Roman Church, we have come of necessity to this sentence against him—'*Our Lord Jesus Christ, by this most holy Council, declareth Nestorius to be deprived of his dignity as bishop, and declares him to be alienated altogether from the society of the priesthood.*'"*

Now let the reader well consider this. It is said by Romanists that the Pope's judgment on any matter of faith is, by virtue of his office as the representative of CHRIST, infallible and final. Yet what takes place in the matter of Nestorius? The Pope unites as Patriarch of the first see with the Patriarch of the third see, and they condemn for heresy the Patriarch of the second

* Labb. et Coss., Conc., tom. i. p. 1422.

see. It seems the general opinion of the Church, expressed in letters and petitions to the Emperor, that Nestorius the accused is by no means silenced by this judgment. On the contrary, he still poisons the Church with his heresy, still maintains his doctrine. There is clearly an utter failure in the pronounced judgment of the bishops, including that, as first, of the Bishop of Rome. It is not heeded. It has no force. Then, at last, recourse is had to a General Council. This General Council takes up the question afresh; enters into all the particulars of the case, and examines the previous sentences of the Bishops S. Celestine and S. Cyril—then, after doing so, pronounces the deposition of the heretical bishop. The Church is now satisfied. The deposition *which did not take effect by the mere judgment of the Bishop of Rome*, though backed by the other bishops, *now does take effect*. We cannot well be told after this, that the power which was appointed by divine right to pronounce the faith of the Church lies invested in the See of S. Peter. At this Council of Ephesus every honour, every respect, all proper authority is given to P. Celestine. It was due to him as holding the Primacy, but the Supremacy was reserved for the sacred synod, meeting to decide the faith under the special promise of the Holy Ghost.

Twenty years pass by, and the heresy of Nestorius seems to be quietly passing away; when

lo, it is revived in its opposite direction by another heresy, that of Eutyches. As Nestorius asserted that there were *two persons* in CHRIST, so Eutyches asserted that there was only *one nature* in CHRIST. The latter heresy flows out of the former, and may best be described in the words of Tillemont:—

"The heresy of Nestorius served both as an occasion and a pretext for that of Eutyches. For wishing to combat that heretic, who declared that the Son of the Virgin was only man and not GOD; he so upheld His being GOD, that he went as far as saying that He was not really man, and that he had only the appearance and not the true human body. Whereas Nestorius would not allow that the Word was made man in uniting the human nature to His divine nature in one person; Eutyches declared that He became man in making out of the divine nature and the human but one substance and but one nature."*

Upon the publication of this heresy, it is in the first instance, according to the law of the Church, brought before the notice of S. Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople. After due examination in a Provincial Council of twenty-nine bishops and twenty-three abbots, Eutyches is condemned and sentenced to excommunication. Upon which

* Tillemont, S. Leon. tom. xv. p. 488.

Eutyches appeals to the Bishops of Rome, of Alexandria, of Jerusalem, and of Thessalonica; that is, in other words, to a General Council. S. Leo, Bishop of Rome, takes up his case, examines it and condemns him, and in so doing writes a very elaborate letter on the doctrine of the Incarnation to S. Flavian. The letter becomes afterwards a text-book in the Church, so clearly and so beautifully does S. Leo expound the orthodox doctrine of the Church. On the other hand however, Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, a most violent and unscrupulous man, stopping at no wickedness to obtain his ends, takes the part of Eutyches, and manages to bring about the assembling of a Council which was intended at first to be general. This Council assembles at Ephesus, and proceeding to try Eutyches, terminates in the most outrageous scenes of tumult and violence. So much so that it has ever since been designated by the name of "Latrocinium" or "Council of Robbers!" Everything said and done at it passes out of the memory of the Church as a thing of wickedness. So great were the atrocities committed there by Dioscorus that S. Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, was carried out of the Council wounded and bleeding through many blows, and died immediately after from the injuries he received. Tillemont calls it "the Martyrdom of S. Flavian." What now is to be done? The whole Church cries out in horror. There must be a new Council.

The faith of CHRIST must not be compromised in the violence of an oppressor. Dioscorus must be put down. Eutyches must be silenced. Accordingly it issues in the fourth General Council, that of Chalcedon. It is called by Marcian the Emperor, in the year 451. Two Legates appear to represent Rome, and no less than 360 bishops assemble for deliberation.

Now we have three great points to consider on this Council :—

1. The condemnation of Dioscorus and Eutyches.

2. The definition of faith involved in this condemnation.

3. The passing of the Canons.

The first was easily disposed of. The whole proceedings of Dioscorus and the Latrocinium; the evident heresy of Eutyches; the obstinacy and determination with which he adhered to opinions so contrary to the Creed of Nicea, brought their own condemnation. Dioscorus was deposed, and Eutyches condemned.

Next came the question of defining the Faith of the Church. Some Romanists assert that the definition of the faith was given by S. Leo in his letter to S. Flavian, and that the Council by adopting his letter acknowledged his power as

Pope, in defining the faith. But on referring to the Acts of the Council, we find that although the letter of Leo is certainly referred to; it is so referred to, not standing alone, but in conjunction with that of S. Cyril of Alexandria. After reciting the Creeds of Nicea and Constantinople, and all agreeing:—

"Aetius the most reverend archdeacon said, 'There is also the Epistle of Cyril, Bishop of Alexandria, of holy and blessed memory, to Nestorius. . . . . There is also another letter of the same Cyril written to John of Antioch, of blessed memory, and if it please you I will recite them.' [Accordingly they were read,] and the most reverend bishops cried out, 'We all believe thus. The Pope Leo thus believes. Anathema to him who divides, Anathema to him who separates the nature of CHRIST. Leo thus believes. Leo *and Anatolius*, [the bishop who succeeded Flavian] thus believe. As Cyril believed, so we believe. Eternal be the memory of Cyril. As the Epistles of Cyril understand it; so we understand it, so we believe.'"*

And then followed the reading of the Epistle of Leo, and that being ended:—

"The most reverend bishops cried out, 'We all believe thus. Anathema to him who does not believe thus. Peter has spoken by Leo. The Apostles taught thus. Piously hath Leo taught.

* Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. ii. p. 286.

Cyril so taught. Eternal be the memory of Cyril. Leo and Cyril have taught alike.' "*

And thus the account goes on all through the reading of the letters. Cyril's words are compared with Leo's, and Leo's with Cyril's. Any one candidly reading through the Acts of the Council will at once see that by the adoption of these letters there is not the slightest idea of receiving one more than another. The letters of both are received with equal acclamation, with equal agreement. The Fathers equally demand time to examine, time to decide, and after time given, and examination had, they adopt and stamp with the authority of the Council both the letters; not that of Leo alone, but that of Cyril also.

Next came the question of passing certain Canons.

In the fifteenth session after all the articles of faith were passed, the clergy of Constantinople asked the legates of Rome to join them in making a Canon concerning the discipline of their Church. But the legates refusing to do this, by the command of the civil officers of the Emperor, the Council proceeded to make the Canon *without the legates*. Now in the second General Council, that of Constantinople, A.D. 381, it was declared in the third Canon, that "the

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. ii. pp. 286—307.

Bishop of Constantinople shall have the primacy of honour after the Bishop of Rome, because Constantinople *is new Rome*." This was never pleasing to the Bishops of Rome, because it gave them the primacy, *on a civil ground*, as the principal city of the Empire, instead of giving it to them on the ground which they claimed, *i.e.* of *divine right*. On the strength of this Canon the power of the Bishop of Constantinople was greatly extended, and in practice he took the precedence of all the provinces and patriarchates of the East, *as new Rome*.

Now the twenty-eighth Canon of the present Council, of which we are speaking, was drawn up to ratify and confirm what had already been done at Constantinople. It recites thus:—

"We, following in all things the decisions of the holy Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon of the hundred and fifty most religious bishops, which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, *New Rome*. For the Fathers properly have allowed the privileges to the throne of the Elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the hundred and fifty most religious bishops, being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy throne of New Rome, judging with reason, that the city which was honoured with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the Elder

Royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her."

Now this Canon did not please the Roman legates, and the reason was plain. They made many remonstrances against it; and desired that their protest might be entered in the Acts of the Council. Nevertheless, the Canon was enacted, and made the Law of the Church. The officers of the Emperor said, "*The whole Council approves of what has been decreed.*"*

Let us now sum up this history of the fourth General Council. What do we find? Heresy again; a deadly heresy pervades the Eastern Church — confusion and discord throughout — patriarch against patriarch, and bishop against bishop; Flavian of Constantinople excommunicates Eutyches, but Dioscorus of Alexandria excommunicates Flavian. Leo of Rome interposes. He, in his turn, is excommunicated likewise by Dioscorus, and the heresy of Eutyches flourishes. S. Leo, with all his ability, all his goodness and all his power—for he certainly was a most wise and eminent bishop—is unable to remedy the evil. Nothing but a General Council, which at last, by his own request, is convened by the Emperor, can relieve the Church of her troubles. His letter, together with S. Cyril's, is produced.

* Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. ii. p. 643.

They are examined with much form, publicly read, commented upon, and approved. Then the Council pronounces that these letters contain the right faith concerning the Incarnation.

Now if S. Leo's letter as Pope had been sufficient in authority to decide the controversy, — why was it not so decided? But his letter is not sufficient *in itself*. It is examined by the Council, stamped with their authority, and then, but not till then, is made sufficient. *So also* with the Canon, which ratifies and confirms a very great power in the Patriarch of Constantinople. S. Leo, by his legates and afterwards by himself, objects to it, but he has no power to stop it. Whether it was that he thought that his own power would be diminished, or whether he contended for the more primitive government of the metropolitans, in opposition to the concentration of power in the hands of one man,—as far as words go, we may doubt, but judging from the generally aggressive attempts of the Popes to concentrate all authority in their own hands, we may well agree with the legates, who objected to the passing of the Canon on the ground that the "*Apostolic See would be humbled.*"

It is clear, perfectly clear; no one would desire to dispute it. The Bishop of Rome in the person of the great S. Leo, shines forth in this Council, and indeed during the whole of his Pontificate, in his just and legitimate *Primacy*. He is everywhere at hand to help and defend the Church.

He takes the lead. He sets forth the faith;—but it is equally clear, and equally no one can dispute it, as long as the Acts of this Council of Chalcedon are in existence he is unable as Bishop of Rome to set forth the faith of his own mere will. The *Supremacy* of the Church is in the General Council, moved and directed by the Spirit of GOD.

CHAPTER XVII.

TOWARDS the middle of the sixth century, Vigilius was Bishop of Rome, and Justinian Emperor; and in the year 553, the fifth General Council, the second at Constantinople, was held under his auspices. The Acts of that Council and the conduct of Vigilius have a most important bearing on the dogma of the Papal Supremacy.

The reader will bear in mind the peculiar heresies which had caused the Councils of Ephesus and of Chalcedon; first that of Nestorius, asserting two persons in CHRIST, thereby disuniting GOD and Man; and secondly, that of Eutyches, asserting one nature in CHRIST, thereby confounding the Godhead and Manhood. There never was a heretic, no matter what his folly or his blasphemy might be, who did not find some followers. So accordingly in these great heresies there were soon found many writers who took up, either directly or indirectly, the cause of those

who were condemned. The doctrine of the Incarnation was of so subtle a nature, and the Eastern mind so full of imagination, that when the one is brought to bear upon the other, it was not surprising that so many keen distinctions were so elaborately drawn forth.

Among those who had gone astray, during or since the session of the two General Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, were most conspicuously these three bishops:—1. Theodorus of Mopsuestia; 2. Theodoret of Cyrus; and 3. Ibas of Edessa. These three men had put before the world certain writings or letters, and to these letters was attached the name of "The Three Chapters."

On the other side of the controversy, as the great defenders of the true faith in the Incarnation, were S. Cyril of Alexandria, presiding at the Council of Ephesus, and S. Leo, Bishop of Rome. Of their writings mention has already been made, and how they were cited at the Council of Chalcedon, examined and approved; and then set forth as documents of the Church illustrating the true faith.

In the course of the examination of S. Leo's and S. Cyril's letters, it was understood that those of *the three Chapters* were condemned. At any rate, if they were not formally and by name condemned, they were virtually so, at least so far as those of S. Leo and S. Cyril were approved.

But as to Theodoret of Cyrus, and Ibas of

Edessa, although their *writings* were condemned, yet as far as their *persons* were concerned, they were, upon recanting their errors, restored to the communion of the Church, and to the possession of their Sees.

Thus the affairs of the Church to all appearance seemed gradually to be working round to peace. But not so in reality. A controversy now arose as to what had taken place at the Council of Chalcedon, and the matter turned upon the question whether the three Chapters had been really condemned; some asserting that they had *not* been condemned: and also whether the letters of S. Cyril and of S. Leo had been properly examined, and made authoritatively matters of faith. This controversy ended by the Emperor Justinian calling together the fifth General Council as before mentioned, in which he states to the hundred and sixty-five bishops there convened, his reasons for so doing. First he alludes to the four preceding General Councils, and states that since the last of them—that of Chalcedon—these writings of Theodorus, Theodoret, and Ibas, had come again under discussion, and that the two latter were pretended to have received the sanction of the Council. Then he concludes—

"As there are still many persons who persist in adhering to these three impious Chapters, we have called you together to this city, and exhort you to declare your opinion."

Meanwhile, what was the conduct of Vigilius, Bishop of Rome?

On the 11th of April, 548, he issues what was called a "Judicatum," or judgment; in which he condemns the three Chapters, "*saving the authority of the Council of Chalcedon.*" This, being a mere compromise, pleased neither party, and the result was that the bishops of Africa, Illyria, and Dalmatia, with two of his own confidential deacons, *withdrew from his communion*, and in the year 550 the African bishops anathematize Vigilius, and *sever him from Catholic Communion*. Nor is this all. Vigilius withdrawing his "Judicatum," while the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 553, is now sitting, publishes a "Constitutum," or Constitution. In this second publication, he condemns certain propositions of Theodorus, and also of Theodoret (two of the Chapters), but with respect to Ibas, (the third Chapter), he says that, "*understood in the best and most pious sense, it was blameless*—and considering the three Chapters generally, *he ordered that after his present declaration, the Church should move no further question.*"

Here then, the Bishop of Rome is found most clearly in regard of the third Chapter, (Ibas, and his heretical writings), *approving of heresy*, and he is found attempting to exercise his authority, as Bishop of Rome, in putting down and silencing all further discussion on the subject. He refuses the command of the Emperor to attend the

Council; issues his Constitution in defiance of the Council and in opposition to the true faith, and endeavours to crush inquiry.

How was this met? The Council reads the Constitution, and sets it aside; then proceeds without him; condemning not only Ibas, but Vigilius himself. In the last conference, the sentence of condemnation stands as follows:—

"If any one defends the letter which Ibas is said to have written to the Persian heretic Maris, which denies that God the Word took flesh of the holy mother of God, ever Virgin Mary . . . . which criminates the holy Cyril as a heretic, who set forth the right Christian faith; . . . . and defends Theodorus and Nestorius and their impious dogmas and writings. . . . . If any one defends that impious letter, and does not anathematize it, *and its defenders, and those who say it is right, or any part of it, and those who have written*, or do write, defences of the impiety which is contained in it, ... let such an one be under Anathema."*

Now the decrees of this Council as Œcumenical are confirmed by the acceptance of the whole Church, and are referred to afterwards by many of the principal Popes who succeed in the chair of S. Peter; and what is most remarkable in this most remarkable history is this. Pope Vigilius himself in a decretal epistle to Eutychius confirms

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. iii. pp. 201, 202.

the Council by his own hand, within a year after its session.*

The history of Vigilius speaks for itself.

First, it shows, by the vacillation throughout on the part of Vigilius, and by his manifest connivance at heresy, that not only has a Pope no certain guarantee in himself that his edicts shall be orthodox, nor any security that a dogma of faith pronounced by him shall be true: but that he may actually put forth what is heretical.

And secondly, it shows that a Pope as well as any other and every other bishop, is subject to the anathema of the Church, and, upon just cause, liable to expulsion from her communion.

At the close of the sixth century lived S. Gregory, Bishop of Rome, one of the best and most faithful bishops who ever filled the chair of S. Peter. He was rightly called "The Great." He was elected to the bishopric in the year 590, and his first step was to write to the Patriarchs of Constantinople, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, with a declaration of his faith. He stated in his letters to them, that he "received the first four Councils as the four Books of the Holy Gospels; that he reverenced the fifth, and that he condemned the 'three Chapters.'" Now it is remarkable, that he as newly elected Pope should think it necessary to

* Mansi, ix. 149, A.

do this. It would seem, if we followed the Romanist notion of the Pope, that being infallible, and beyond error, there was no necessity either in himself to imagine, or for others to suspect, that he could be otherwise than orthodox in faith; and that being above all other bishops, he had no need in any way to recognise these Eastern patriarchs, as persons to whom he had need to give account. But the gentleness and humility of S. Gregory shone far above such narrow-minded ways. His was a love for the Church, not for himself; not for a party, but Him Whom he served.

And it is the more remarkable, because S. Gregory, with all his humility, was a most vigorous defender of the rights and privileges of the See of S. Peter. He often declared that he would rather lose his life, than that through him any of the rights of the Bishopric of Rome should be lost. He was quite equal even to S. Leo, in the determination which he manifested to correct abuses, maintain discipline, and purify the doctrines of the Church. He knew and felt his place as the first bishop of the world, and was ever ready to fulfil the charge that lay upon him as the follower of S. Peter—"Feed My sheep." And therefore the more strongly and the more pointedly does his testimony come forth when he unfolds, by his letters and by his actions, that his idea of being the first bishop in the Church was totally opposed to any notion,

that by so being *first*, he was sole, or *supreme*. In one of his letters to Eulogius, Bishop of Alexandria, he writes thus :—

"Your Holiness has said much to me in your letters concerning the chair of S. Peter, chief of the Apostles, declaring that he continues to sit in it himself, in the person of his successors. Indeed I confess myself for my own part to be unworthy, not merely in the rank of those who rule, but in number of those who stand. But I have willingly received all that was said, because *he who speaks to me concerning Peter's chair was the person who occupied it*. And though I in no way take pleasure in honour peculiar to myself, yet I am greatly delighted that your Holiness gives to yourself what you bestow on me."

Then quoting the charge given to S. Peter —"Feed My sheep"—he goes on :—

"And thus though the Apostles may be many, yet the See of the chief of the Apostles (which belongs to one, though it is in three places) prevailed in authority, solely by virtue of his [S. Peter's] chiefship. For it is he which exalted the See in which he also condescended to take his rest and finish the present life.* It is he who adorned the See to which he sent the Evangelist, his disciple.† It is he who established the See in

---

* *Rome*, in which the Apostle Peter died.

† *Alexandria*, in which the Evangelist S. Mark, the disciple of S. Peter, was first bishop.

which he sat for seven years, though he was to leave it.* Inasmuch then as the See over which by Divine authority *three bishops now preside*, is one man's and one—whatever good I hear of you, I lay to my own account; and if you hear any good of me, lay this to the account of your own desert; because we are one with Him Who saith, 'That they all may be one, as Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us.' "†

There could not well be framed a compliment more delicate than this, which, at the same time that it conveys a high notion of the prerogatives of S. Peter, yet in the greatest humility imparts these prerogatives to Alexandria and Antioch, and by no means appropriates them to Rome. We may take this idea as the sure index of the mind of the Church in S. Gregory's time. The government of the souls of men was not invested in Rome, but shared with the other bishops. S. Gregory did not say, "I am the sole and only successor of Peter; I, as such successor, do of my own power and authority govern the whole Church, representing CHRIST, and standing in His place,"—but he said: "We are all, in our order, and in our place, successors of Peter. The Rock on which we stand is the Church, and the bishops

---

* *Antioch*, which was founded by S. Peter, and in which he governed the Church before he went to Rome.

† S. Gregory, Ep., lib. 7.

taken together are one in CHRIST, as CHRIST is one with the Father."

But we have more to say than this about S. Gregory; for what he taught in his letters in giving graceful way to others, he had occasion to exemplify in act when others presumed upon an authority which was not theirs.

In the year 589, another Gregory, Patriarch of Antioch, was accused of a grievous crime. He appealed to the Emperor in his defence, and went to Constantinople and was tried. He came forth from the accusation perfectly clear and absolved. At the Council which heard this trial under the Emperor's direction, John, Patriarch of Constantinople, who presided, assumed the the title of Œcumenical, or "Universal Bishop." Now it certainly was conceded by the 28th Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, that the Patriarch of Constantinople, "*as new Rome*," should have privileges over the other bishops of the East; but this Canon was not accepted by S. Leo, nor was it ever admitted in the West. When therefore this title was assumed and set before the Church, it seemed to S. Gregory, that as Patriarch of Rome, his duty was to expostulate against it. He accordingly wrote to the Bishops of Alexandria and Antioch, warning them against using the title. In this letter he says:—

"As your venerable Holiness is aware, this name *Universal* was offered, during the holy Synod of Chalcedon, to the Pontiff of the Apos-

tolic See, a post which by GOD's providence I fill. But no one of my predecessors ever consented to use so profane a term, because plainly, if a single Patriarch is called *Universal*, the name of Patriarch is taken from the rest . . . . . Wherefore let your Holiness in your letters never call any one *Universal*, lest in offering undue honour to another, you should deprive yourself of that which is your due."

In another letter to the Emperor Maurice he says :—

"When Antichrist at his coming, calls himself GOD, will it not be very frivolous, but yet cause great destruction? If we look at the amount of what is said, it is but two syllables, [Deum] but if at the weight of the iniquity, it is universal destruction. But I confidently affirm, that whosoever calls himself or desires to be called *Universal Priest*, is, in his pride, going before *Antichrist*, because through pride he prefers himself to the rest."*

And he writes to the Patriarch John himself in the same language—tells him that he is taking to himself the grace which was meant for all in common; that the sole Head of the Universal Church is CHRIST; and asks him, "what account he will have to render to GOD at the last day, if he thus tries to subject to himself as universal bishop the members of CHRIST, all of whom are equal."†

* Greg. Epist. lib. vii. 33. † Idem Ep. lib. v. 18.

Now what shall we say? Here is one of the greatest of the bishops of Rome; certainly one to us best known, for to him the Anglo-Saxons owe their Christianity; he acknowledges the equality of all the Patriarchs with himself; he declares that the only Head over all the Church is CHRIST our Lord; he denounces as Antichrist any one that should assume the title of Universal Bishop, and by that set himself over others; he says, that all the bishops are members one of another in CHRIST, and that any one who goes out of his way to set himself over others is acting in opposition to the whole theory of the Church; that Church resting on the common Rock, which is the Faith of CHRIST.

Now having heard what S. Gregory says, let any one observe the Papacy as it at present rules over the Roman Church, and identify the nineteenth century with the sixth, *if he can*.

On the 14th of May, A.D. 626, Honorius succeeded Boniface V. as Bishop of Rome. In his time the former heresy of Eutyches, which taught one nature in CHRIST, was revived, but in a modified form. The followers of Eutyches had obtained the name of "Monophysites," a word meaning "one nature," and the sect which now arose took the opposite name of "Monothelites," a word meaning "one will." Though at the first appearance, the new sect might seem the opposite of the former one, yet in reality

it was but an off-shoot or branch arising out of it, and contained a heresy equally prenicious. The Monothelites allowed two natures in CHRIST, but explained these two natures in such a sense as to destroy what they seemed to allow; for they said, that after the union of the two natures of GOD and man in one Person, there was only one will, and one operation of that will. This heresy was maintained by Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople, and Theodorus Bishop of Paran, and was mainly opposed by Sophronius, Patriarch of Jerusalem, who rightly argued that to take away the will and the operation of that will from a nature, was to destroy that nature; for said he, "As each nature preserves its own properties, so each operates that which is proper to itself, since natures are known only by their operations." When the advocates of this heresy perceived that the Church was greatly opposed to it, they endeavoured to conceal their meaning, after the manner of heretics, by merely wishing silence to be kept on the subject of the *two wills*, or *two operations*. They said, "We will be content not to force positively on you the assertion of one operation; if we, on our part, be not forced to declare there are two." At this stage in the heresy it is that Pope Honorius becomes implicated in it. A letter written by him to Sergius, of Constantinople, in which he takes his view of the case in opposition to Sophronius

is preserved in the Acts of the Councils. In that letter he states as follows :—

"Since indeed the Divinity could not either be crucified, nor experience or suffer human passions; but on account of the ineffable conjunction of the human and Divine nature—on the one part GOD is said to suffer, and on the other, the humanity is said together with the Divinity to have descended from heaven; therefore it is that we confess *One will of our Lord Jesus Christ;* because indeed our nature was taken up by the Divinity, but not the sin involved in it; that nature indeed which was created before sin, not that which was vitiated after the fall." *

And at the end of the letter he says :—

"Let your fraternity set forth this together with us, as *we too set forth this*, ENTIRELY AGREEING WITH YOU."

And in another letter he declares his judgment that—

"The newly introduced opinion of one or two operations ought to be removed from the preaching of the faith, for what do they who thus speak conceive; save, according to the expression of *one or two natures*, so likewise *one or two operations* of CHRIST our GOD? About which Holy Scripture writes plainly. But it is utterly vain to conceive or state that our Lord JESUS CHRIST,

* Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. iii. p. 1319.

the Mediator of God and men, is or was of *One or Two Operations.*"*

As all other heresies, so this. It created the most bitter feeling among all parties. Honorius himself was called away to his great account before any public notice was taken of what he had done and said, and he died in peace; but not long after his death such commotions and persecutions began, as in those days seemed the inseparable attendants of controversy. Heraclius, the Emperor, for the sake of peace, and with the aid of Sergius, set forth an exposition of faith, by which all controversies as to whether there were two or one Will in Christ, were forbidden, although still in the very same exposition the doctrine of one will was covertly introduced. In the East, this edict of Heraclius seemed to prevail, but not so in the West. John IV., Bishop of Rome, next but one in succession to Honorius, assembled a Council in which the Monothelites were condemned; but a careful silence was observed concerning Honorius. It was a judicious thing not to give the heretics the advantage of so great a name as that of the first Bishop of the West. Then followed S. Martin, Bishop of Rome, in the year 649, who in a Bull of Excommunication condemned all the defenders of the Monothelite heresy, including in effect, though not naming, the very

* Labbe et Cossart, Conc., tom. iii. p. 1351.

emperors who had put forth these expositions of heretical doctrine. But the emperors were not to be so treated with impunity. S. Martin suffered for his faithfulness to the Church, and he ended his days in banishment on the inhospitable shore of the Tauric Chersonese, while the Abbot Maximus, who had been a principal defender of the faith, was inhumanly punished by the loss of his tongue and of his right hand.

At length, matters came to such a pass, that there could be no resource but a reference to the whole Church. Constantine Pogonatus, with the help and advice of Agatho, Bishop of Rome, in the year 683, called together the sixth Œcumenical Council. It assembled at Constantinople; one hundred and seventy bishops were present, Agatho, Bishop of Rome, being represented by four deputies, who delivered from him a clear statement of the Catholic faith.

And now at last there was a hope that the true doctrine would be taught, and peace restored to the Church; but in achieving this, what was to be done with Honorius, who, as Bishop of Rome, had encouraged and partaken in the very heresy which was to be discussed. In all honesty and truthfulness, his letters to Sergius, as above mentioned, were read before the Council; and being read, his opinions were but too plain. He had joined with Sergius and Cyrus; he had expressed himself heretically; he had taken part against Sophronius, who had defended the faith.

Therefore does the Council proceed to judgment, and Honorius is condemned. In the thirteenth session of the Council, the Fathers declared that "The letters of Honorius, equally as those of Sergius, Pyrrhus, and others, were foreign to the Apostolical decrees, and to the definitions of the holy Councils and of all the approved Fathers," and that they "followed the false doctrines of heretics."

"We therefore," continued they, "utterly reject them, and execrate them as soul-destroying. . . . . And together with these, Sergius, Pyrrhus, &c., we order that Honorius, who was Pope of ancient Rome, be *cast out of the Holy Church* of *God*, and *anathematized*, because we find by his writings to Sergius, that he has in all things followed his mind, and confirmed his impious dogmas."

And then, in the usual manner, when the Council pronounced anathemas, Honorius is mentioned with the other heretics: "Anathema to Theodore of Paran; Anathema to Sergius; *Anathema to Honorius.*" *

Still further: The Acts of the Council, according to the usual form, are sent to all the bishops, and among others to Pope Leo II., who had succeeded Agatho in the intervening time; and Pope Leo writes back in these terms:

"We anathematize alike those inventors of

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. iii. p. 1625.

new error; that is, Theodore of Paran; Cyrus of Alexandria; Sergius, Pyrrhus, &c., &c., plotters against rather than prelates of the Church of Constantinople; *and also Honorius,* who did not illumine this Apostolical Church with the doctrine of Apostolical tradition, but by a foul betrayal attempted to subvert its spotless faith."

And these expressions are over and over again repeated; as writing an account of this Council to the Bishops of Spain, he says:

"They who had fought against the purity of Apostolic tradition, being departed, *have been punished with eternal condemnation;* that is, Theodorus of Paran; Cyrus of Alexandria; Sergius, Paul, Peter of Constantinople, *together with Honorius,* who did not, as it became the Apostolical authority, extinguish the flame of heretical doctrine, but by his negligence fanned it."*

The reader must now decide for himself on the several particulars involved in this history. He must first remember the claims set forth by the Romanists of the present day in regard to the Papal Chair. He must then compare those claims with the facts here developed.

1. *As to Jurisdiction.*—The claim is, that the

*For fuller accounts of all this, see Bossuet, "Def. Cler. Gall.," lib. vii. c. 21—26.

Pope has the sole jurisdiction and the sole power in settling controversies of faith; but here, as in all the previous cases, the heresy arises, is considered among the bishops where it arises, creates confusion far and wide throughout the Church, but no power seems to arise to put it down. The Pope, in whom according to theory the power is vested, makes no attempt, or if he makes any, makes an ineffectual attempt, to explain it away. The civil power then interferes; the emperor strives to crush it by violence; he is equally unsuccessful; Pope succeeds to Pope, but nothing is gained. There are Provincial Councils, but they do nothing. The heresy still lives. It is not crushed. It still prevails —and until the General Council is called together the peace of the Church is not restored.

2. *As to Infallibility.*—It is claimed that the inheritance of Peter's chair confers upon its occupant, through the Grace of God, so clear a power of judgment, that in considering a case of faith, he is guided to such a decision as cannot contain in it any error. But here we find a Pope who in other respects is testified as having filled the chair with benefit to the Church, not only failing in a judgment to be made concerning a controversy, but actually committing himself to the wrong side, and by his writings advocating the heresy which it was his office to clear away and obliterate. All is tried to conceal this fact,

and for forty long years after his death, the erroneous judgment is hidden away in silence. But though the heretic sleeps in the silence of death, and the din of controversy is closed over his grave, the heresy itself will not be hushed, and the sharp passions of men will not slumber. Then the Church steps forth. In her highest and only undisputed form, she cites both the heresy and the heretics before her. Four patriarchs are involved in it. Those of Alexandria, Constantinople, Jerusalem, and Rome. They are heard in their defence. The authors of the heresy are condemned and anathematized. The favourer and abettor of the heresy is also condemned and anathematized. Who is this favourer and abettor? *The Patriarch of Rome.* Jerusalem, in the person of her Bishop Sophronius, is the sole defender of the Faith.

Nor is this all. The heretical Pope is anathematized and cast out, not only by the Council, but by his own successors, Agatho and Leo; and by subsequent Councils confirming what had been done, it is handed down to the Church of subsequent ages as a matter of historical fact. It is fair to say that it is not all Romanists who claim the power of infallibility in the Papal chair.* We speak only of those,

* The Gallican Church has ever held the same course as the Anglican in disputing the claim of the Pope to infallibility. Bossuet, in his account of the heresy of Honorius,

who are however now most unhappily the most predominant in influence and in number, who are called the Ultramontane party; and we say of them that in this history of Honorius their cause must by any candid mind be utterly condemned.

The question is this. On one side there is a judgment made by a Pope, who in his Chair of S. Peter pronounces concerning the faith. On the other side, there is an Œcumenical Council, received and acted upon by one Pope, and confirmed by another. Which side shall we take?

If we take the side of the Pope alone, we are ourselves guilty of heresy, pronounced to be such by a General Council, with other Popes confirm-

---

distinctly cites it as one of many instances against them. He is speaking of the deceitful manner in which Baronius and Bellarmine endeavour to shelter Honorius; and he sums up thus:—

"Wherefore, that we may at last end this discussion, these things we find to be certain.

"1. That Honorius, duly questioned by these Patriarchs concerning the faith, answered in the very worst manner.

"2. That he was condemned under Anathema by the sixth Council.

"3. That he was excused by the Roman Pontiffs before the supreme sentence of the Council was delivered, but *after the sentence, was condemned* with the same Anathema.

"4. That Bellarmine and Baronius betook themselves to fables, because they could find nothing else on which to rest the defence of Honorius."—Def. Cler. Gall., lib. vii. c. 27.

ing it. If we take the side of the General Council backed by the other Popes, we are compelled to pronounce Honorius, Pope of Rome, a heretic. Of course, we are compelled by common sense to say, with the Roman Church herself, that an edict of a General Council received by a Pope must be the right one. If so, the conclusion is fatal. Two contradictions cannot be true. Pope Honorius advocated and wrote in favour of Monothelism. Forty years after his death, Popes Agatho and Leo condemned him; the one voluntarily expressing his opinion ; the other so directed by a General Council. If, as I suppose every sane mind must, we take the side of Agatho and Leo, the consequence is immediate. Embracing the ancient discipline of the Church confirmed over and over again by the canons, we discard the Papal Supremacy ; we seek our shelter in a General Council.

CHAPTER XVIII.

Christianity had a double field in which the seeds of its faith were sown: one was Judaism, the other Heathenism. The characteristic feature of Heathenism was its love for idolatry; the setting up of visible representations of the Deity, and the worshipping of those visible representations in the place of the Deity Himself. The characteristic feature of Judaism was an intense hatred

of idolatry, based upon the express warning of Almighty God against all sensual ideas in religion, and in remembrance of the great command in the Decalogue: "Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image." The converted heathens in the first ages readily abandoned their love of visible representations, because the conditions demanded of them in their admission to the Church were imperative, and because the Jewish element exclusively prevailed. Time, however, and a gradual mixture with the enlightened portion of the heathens, wore off the sharp points of this Jewish element; and by degrees the heathen idea of the beauty of statues, images, and pictures crept silently into the Church. "The most audacious pencil," says Gibbon, "might tremble in the rash attempt of defining by forms and colours the Infinite Spirit, the Eternal Father, Who pervades and sustains the Universe. But the superstitious mind was more easily reconciled to paint and to worship the Angels, and above all, the Son of God, under the human shape which on earth they have condescended to assume." * Legends and fables, love of relics, and remembrances of the dead, found, in the works of art with which the Romans and the Greeks had decorated their heathen temples, a kindred feeling; and very soon the churches of Christians were elaborately orna-

* Gibbon, chap. xlix.

mented with pictures and images of the Blessed Virgin, of Saints, and of JESUS the SON of GOD. This soon advanced from perhaps an innocent encouragement of devotion to a superstitious use; and the evil against which the second commandment guards the human mind began to be visible. The Jews taunted the Christians with their apparent idolatry, and the Mahometans, who now had risen into power, and who had derived from their Koran a hatred to graven images quite equal to the Jews, remarked with ridicule a sensual worship of the Deity in men, who read or pretended to read in their Scriptures, that "GOD is a Spirit, and they that worship Him, must worship Him in spirit and in truth."

Fearful indeed is the handle given to infidelity in the absurd legends which are devoutly believed, even to this day, by the superstitious; and fearful the degradation of mind which could have led either the imagination to invent, or the human reason to submit to, the profanations which are recorded in the pages of history in reference to image worship. The commencement seems to have been in the image of our LORD said to have been sent to Agbarus, King of Edessa, when he invoked His miraculous power to heal him of a mortal sickness. The perfect impression of our Blessed LORD'S Face is said, by the legend, to have been made on linen, and a promise given that the city of Edessa should never be taken by

a foreign enemy. This image, however, is not mentioned in Eusebius,* although he faithfully records the correspondence by letter which took place between our LORD and that king. Nor do we find for five hundred years any mention of it, A reasonable faith will hesitate at embracing a fable which it took 500 years to bring to light, nor can we be justly blamed in doubting the reality of a miracle which the Fathers of the Church have thought it wise to leave in obscurity.

But such is the legend. The image of Edessa having, according to the Divine promise, delivered the city from the arms of Chosroes,† was held in

---

* Euseb. "Hist. Eccl." lib. i. c. 13.

† The legend of the image of Edessa is seriously mentioned in the second Council of Nicea, as an argument for Image Worship, advocated by that Council, as the reader will see further on. First it is mentioned in Pope Gregory's letter to the Emperor:—

"When CHRIST dwelt at Jerusalem, Agbarus, who at that time was King of the Edessenes, having heard of His miracles, wrote a letter to CHRIST, who in return sent an answer written with His own hand, and He also sent a representation of His own sacred and most glorious countenance."—Gregorii Papæ II., Epistola. Labb. et Coss., Conc. tom. iv. p. 6.

And it is afterwards mentioned in the fifth action of the Council, cited from Evagrius. Chosroes is described as having made an enormous bank, with the intenton of attacking the besieged city of Edessa from a higher position than the walls of the city themselves. The besieged, on

the greatest veneration, and became the exemplar and pattern of other images, which might have a like miraculous power. The following hymn to the image of Edessa will suggest to us how little removed from positive idolatry was the idea of image-worship then prevailing:—

"How can we with mortal eyes contemplate this image, whose celestial splendour the Host of

---

the other hand, prepared a mound of wood and inflammable matter opposed to it; with the intention of burning down and so destroying the enemies' bank. Then the account goes on thus:—

"But having set fire to the mound, they were disappointed in their plan, the fire not having a free passage from want of air. When they had altogether failed, they bring down the *divinely-made Image*, which indeed no hands of man had formed. For CHRIST our GOD had sent it to Agbarus when he had expressed a wish to see Him. Introducing then this Sacred Image through a passage which they had dug, and sprinkling it with water, they let it down through the pile of wood. And immediately, the divine virtue was visible to the faith of the workmen, and that which was before impossible was now effected. For the wood caught fire directly, and being quickly reduced to live embers, was imparted in flames to that which was above it, the fire making advances on all sides."

After this (referring to the Acts of the Council), the Reader of the Royal Church of Constantinople said:—

"And I, your most unworthy servant, when I went down to Syria with the Royal Commissioners, was at Edessa, *and I saw the Sacred Image, not made with hands*, treated with honour and adored by the faithful." This is all found in the Councils of Labbe and Cossart, tom. iv. p. 315, in the account of the Second Nicene Council.

Heaven presumes not to behold? He who dwells in Heaven condescends this day to visit us by His venerable Image. He who is seated on the Cherubim, visits us this day by a picture, which the Father has delineated with His immaculate Hand; which He has formed in an ineffable manner, and which we sanctify, by adoring it with fear and love."*

Following close upon the image of Edessa, was the legend of the Veronica. It was said that in the "agony and bloody sweat," our Blessed Lord applied to His sacred Face a napkin, which afterwards He gave to a holy matron, and that this napkin for ever retained the sacred image of His countenance. And again, the same idea of representation very soon extended from that of our Lord Himself to His mother, and in the church of Diospolis, in Palestine, the features of the Mother of God were said to be inscribed on a marble column. From thence again the transition was easy to the figures and the paintings of saints, of angels, and of martyrs, until they were commonly resorted to, as defences in time of danger, for protection in battle, and as charms against evil spirits. Processions were formed in honour of them, the people carrying them about the streets, and they were set up in churches as direct objects of adoration.

No wonder then, that towards the beginning

* See Gibbon, ch. xlix.

of the eighth century, when the Mahomedan religion stood before the world in such contrast with this perverted Christianity, the minds of the deeper-thinking should be turned to this all-important question.

Here was a great abuse, a fearful danger to the purity of the Christian faith. The simplicity with which our LORD had taught His disciples to worship and to pray was well-nigh lost. Heresy in doctrine had now produced its sure fruit: desecration of practice in all the higher tones of the adoration of the Diety.

The first movement towards a reform in this matter originated in Philippicus Bardanes, who became Emperor of the Greeks in the year 712. He first commanded a picture to be taken down in the church of S. Sophia at Constantinople. He then sent orders to Rome, directing that all representations of every kind, either by picture or statue, should be removed from the churches. But Constantine, then Bishop of Rome, not only refused obedience to this order, but assembled a Council, in which he defended the use of images, and caused the Emperor, in objecting to them, to be condemned as an apostate! This opposition of Bardanes to the religious customs of the age cost him no less than his throne and his life.

But the first spark had now been set to a fire which was not soon to be quenched. Leo the Isaurian, a prince of vigorous mind and intrepid resolution, succeeded to the empire. He issued

an edict in the year 726, by which it was ordered that worship of images should be abandoned, and that all pictures and representations, except that of CHRIST'S crucifixion, should be removed from the churches. But he little knew how deep-seated in a superstitious people was the love of the things which he strove to abolish. He little calculated upon the rancorous spirit of opposition which he was about to call forth throughout the whole Church. Christians were divided into two parties—the "Iconoduli," or worshippers of images, and the "Iconoclastæ," or breakers of images. The former conceived it part of their religious duty to uphold the adoration of their images; and it was a point with them not only of honour but of faith to preserve the sacred memorials, of their churches. The latter, maintaining that such worship was unlawful and idolatrous, thought it their duty to demolish and break every statue and every picture that met their view. The end of this contest was no less than a civil war, the alienation of the Papacy from the dominion of Constantinople, and ultimate severance of the Empire of the West from that of the East.

Leo the Isaurian died in the year 741. Constantine Copronymus, his son, inherited both his father's throne and his father's aversion to image-worship. Animated with a fiery zeal, he abolished on all sides the objects of his religious abhorrence; but aware that the Greeks held in high estimation

the opinions of *a Council*, his prudence suggested that they would be more likely to obey him if his commands were clothed with the appearance of Church authority. He accordingly summoned a Council of Eastern bishops in the year 754, before whom he laid the whole question, and desired their opinion and concurrence. There were no less than three hundred and thirty-eight bishops present at this Council, but no one patriarch, nor any deputies from the Sees of Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem. A decree was published, condemning not only a superstitious worship or undue veneration of images, but commanding the absolute rejection of every image and picture from the churches, and forbidding all persons to make them for the future under pain of Anathema. At the same time, Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, George of Cyprus, and John Damascenus, because they had in their writings advocated the use of images, were anathematized.

Leo IV. succeeding his father Constantine, was declared Emperor in the year 775. He pursued the same measures as his father and grandfather in the extirpation of religious images; but his career was suddenly cut short in 780, by a cup of poison administered by his wife, the profligate Irene. In the year 796, she entered into an alliance with Hadrian, Bishop of Rome, and the result was the appointment of the second Council of Nicea, wherein, with the co-operation

of Tarasius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the decrees of the former Council were set aside. This Council of Nicea assembled in the year 787, and was attended by three hundred and fifty oriental bishops, together with the legates of Pope Hadrian. A letter from the Pope to the Empeor was read, in which he advocated the cause of images, and condemned the proceedings of the former Council. This letter was approved and adopted by the Council. Great pains were taken to show the difference between the abuse of images and their use as ornaments and accessories of religious worship; and the distinction between absolute and relative worship was carefully insisted on. The tradition of the Church was declared to be in favour of the custom of preserving images in churches, and those who would object to their use were declared innovators. Finally, in the seventh session, a definition of faith was recited in the followings words :—

"We decide that the holy images, whether painted or graven, or of whatever kind they may be, ought to be exposed to view. Whether in churches, upon the sacred vessels or vestments, upon walls, or in private houses, or by the wayside. Since the oftener Jesus Christ, the Blessed Mother, and the saints, are seen in their images, the more will men be led to think of the originals, and to love them. Salutation and the adoration of honour ought to be paid to images, but not the worship of latreia, which belongs to

God alone. Nevertheless, it is lawful to burn lights before them, and to incense them, as is usually done with the cross, the books of the Gospels, and other sacred things, according to the pious use of the ancients. For honour so paid to the image is transmitted to the original which it represents."*

But this decree, although seemingly set forth with authority, was by no means received by the Eastern Church; for it was natural that men condemned by the latter Council would appeal to the preceding one, by which the abolition of images was decreed with equal force. The two Councils speaking oppositely could not equally be true. Just therefore as in all such cases, the one side destroyed the other, and the Image-worshippers and Image-breakers carried on their contest as vigorously as ever.

Now while the Italians, including the Pope Hadrian and the Roman bishops, were violently in favour of the retention of images, and the rest of the Western Church, especially the British, the Germans, and the Gauls, steered a middle course, and while they acknowledged that there might be some advantage in a proper use of images, they inclined rather to think that the natural tendency of the human mind would be towards a superstitious or idolatrous worship of them. Conjoined with this feeling, which seemed

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. iv. p. 455.

predominant in the Western and Northern portions of the Church, was the rise of the wise and powerful Emperor Charlemagne. He took the side of the Iconoclasts, or opposers of image-worship. He wrote, either himself or by the hands of others, the four celebrated books, called afterwards "The Caroline Books," the object of which was to put down the superstitious usages which were then prevailing. He urged upon Pope Hadrian the necessity of abandoning the decrees of the late Council of Nicea, and of assuming a purer and more healthy tone in the worship of the Church. But after some time, not prevailing with the Pope, he himself as Emperor assembled a Council of the Western bishops at Frankfort-on-the-Maine.

At this Council, as might be expected from the influence of Charlemagne, the controversy takes another turn. The bishops of France, Germany, Aquitaine, and England, to the number of three hundred, with two delegates from Hadrian, have no idea that they are bound by the decrees of the second Council of Nicea; nor will they admit that Council to be of any authority. Pope Hadrian writes to them, and assures them of the authenticity of the Acts of that Council, and assures them of his own approval of them. Nevertheless, all that had been done at Nicea is undone at Frankfort. The Western bishops pay no heed to the Acts of a Council which they dispute. They distinctly reject every kind of worship—"bending of the neck," "bowing of the knee," or "oblation of

incense;" and allow no worship whatever, either relative or positive, and they say:—

"Though what the Greeks do, in adoring images, may be avoided by all learned persons, who venerate not what they are, but what they represent; yet they are a cause of offence to all the unlearned, who venerate and adore in them nothing but what they see."*

And this is confirmed by the Council of Paris, held in 825, twenty-eight years after, in which the bishops declare that "adoration of images is superstitious and sinful; and they say, that without approving the Acts of the Council of Constantinople of 754, they condemn the second Council of Nicea, and hold that it was no light error on the part of those who composed it to assert that not only images should be venerated and adored and called holy, but that even some degree of holiness could be attained through their means."†

And now the reader will naturally be asking for what purpose all this is written. It is written not for any argument on the adoration of images, but to show the position of a national Church in the 8th and 9th centuries in relation to the Pope. Although the question was not one concerning the faith of the Church, but rather one of reli-

* Car. Magn. "Adv. Imag.," lib. iii. c. 6, quoted from Palmer.

† Goldast. "Imp. Decreta de Imag." p. 626, quoted by Palmer, vol. ii. p. 155.

gious practice; still it was one of immense magnitude as dealing with the first principles of divine worship. It was one, moreover, (as was too evident in the sequel,) which affected the deepest religious habits of Christians, and touched upon that inflammable material, *Superstition*, which, in the vulgar mind, too often takes the place of real religion. And what was done? What are the lessons which we learn from it, as affecting the question we have at issue? We learn these two most important truths:—

1. *That a Pope's authority, or opinion, or decree, is of no weight in itself beyond that of a private bishop.* In this case a Roman Pontiff had taken part in, and by his legates been present at, a Council of the Eastern Church, which was desired to be made Œcumenical. He had issued a decretal letter, in which he set forth as far as his authority went, his judgment that such Council should be held as Œcumenical, and that its acts should be accepted by the whole Church. He had also written generally in the defence of image-worship, arguing against the Caroline Books, which had been put forth by the Emperor. He also wrote to the Council of Frankfort when he heard that it had assembled, sent his legates there again and communicated to them an authentic copy of the Acts of the Nicene Council concerning which they were to meet; and he conveyed to them in a letter his own opinion and

wishes. Nevertheless, what took place? In the presence of the legates, the Western bishops decided against the decretal letters, and against the Council, which the Pope desired to be considered Œcumenical. They made a decree also against the image-worship which the Pope had advocated.

For was this second Council of Nicea Œcumenical, or was it not? Did the decree of the Pope make it so, or did it not? "The several chronicles of France and Germany," says Mr. Palmer, "incidentally speak of it as a Pseudo-Synod." The Annales Francorum, written about A.D. 808, say that at the Synod of Frankfort, "the Pseudo-Synod of the Greeks, falsely called the seventh, and which they made to sanction the adoration of images, *was rejected by the bishops.** . . . Eginhard, in his Annales Francorum, written A.D. 829, says that at Frankfort, the Synod, which had been called not only "seventh" but "universal," was entirely annulled by all, as of no force, that it might be either held or spoken of as universal. In 824, the Gallican bishops condemned it. Hincmar, Archbishop of Rheims, about 870, speaks of the "Pseudo-Synod" of Nice as entirely destroyed and annulled by a general Synod in France. †

---

* See Palmer's "Treatise on the Church," Part iv. ch. x. sect. 4.

† See further testimonies in Palmer's Treatise.

After considering all these points, we cannot well be told that the decision of the Pope in regulating the affairs of the Church is final, and that no other exists save in him. At any rate, so far as the eighth century it was not so esteemed.

2. Further, we gather out of this history *that national Churches assembled in Synod have a voice in rejecting or receiving decrees of Councils passed in other countries, and in which they have had no participation.**

In the present case, the bishops of the West had not been called to the Council of Nicea. They reserved therefore to themselves the right of judging and of accepting those decrees when made known to them.

In rejecting them, which they did, they caused *ipso facto*, the Council of Nicea, as before shown, to be not Œcumenical. They annulled it as an authority of the Church for ever; so that its voice is of no more authority as a Council on one side decreeing a practice, than that of Frankfort is on the other, abjuring a practice.

Now put these two great truths together, and what is the result in regard of the Papal Supremacy? In what place and in whose hands lies the decision of articles of faith, or the judgment

* This principle is of immense importance to the English Church, in reference to Trent.

on matters of discipline and practice? Does it lie in the hands of the Pope? If so, how came it to pass that in the matter of image-worship the whole Western Church, except perhaps some few Roman bishops, rejected the Pope's authority? Does it lie in a Council of the Church of any country, if that Council is approved by the Pope, and its edicts are sanctioned by him, and transmitted to other countries? If so, how came it to pass, that in the case of image-worship the edicts of the second Council of Nicea, backed as it was by the authority of Hadrian, fell to the ground, and were disputed by the Gallican Church, and openly discarded?

CHAPTER XIX.

From the time that Constantinople became the first Patriarchate of the East, and by the canons of Chalcedon in the year 451, took precedence of the ancient Apostolical Churches of Antioch, Alexandria and Jerusalem, there had been nothing but jealousy and schism throughout the Church. The division of the Roman Empire brought in its train the division of the Church, and the very titles of "Elder Rome" and "New Rome," by which the seats of the rival bishoprics were distinguished, too clearly marked the ambitious spirit by which the rulers of those two bishoprics would assert their spiritual power.

The difference of language and of habits which cut off the East from the West, would only add to this unhappy feeling. The warm imagination and the philosophic curiosity of the Asiatic, plunged the whole East into those minute discussions concerning the nature of the Godhead, which never ended otherwise than by heresy upon heresy; while the more wary Italian seized each opportunity in the weakness of his rival engendered by those heresies, to add to his own supremacy, and to magnify his own dominion. Hence the continual anathemas and excommunications of bishop against bishop, and patriarch against patriarch, which stain the pages of this period of Church history; hence the constant outbreaks of anger, ambition, and jealousy, with which the East and the West were mutually set against each other, destroying not only external communion, but that internal love which had been pronounced more than once by our Blessed Lord to be the best sign of His discipleship, and of His faith.

So early as in the age of the Arian controversy, communion between the East and the West was for a time suspended, and the rival Councils of Sardica and Philipopolis (A.D. 347), beheld the bishops of one division of the Roman Empire in open hostility to the other.

No sooner was this bitterness allayed, than a second suspension of communion arose in the matter of Meletius, A.D. 360. A disputed succes-

sion of bishops in the See of Antioch destroyed the Unity of the Church for sixty-eight years, and the East and West were either partially or wholly out of each other's communion during that period. Then came the matter of Acacius at the close of the fifth century, and another breach arose, which lasted thirty-five years. The Patriarch of Constantinople, following the principles of the Council of Chalcedon, assumed the same authority over the Eastern bishops as the Patriarch of Rome was used to exercise over those of the West; and when a certain bishop, John Talaia, was elected Patriarch of Alexandria, because that election was not notified to him for confirmation, he excommunicated John Talaia the elected Patriarch, and appointed, or caused to be appointed, one Peter Mongus in his stead. John Talaia, not recognising the authority of Acacius, appealed to Rome, and Felix III., then Pope, took up the cause. In a Council of seventy Italian bishops, Felix pronounced sentence of excommunication against Acacius in the following words:—

"Have therefore thy portion with those whom thou willingly embracest, according to the present sentence, which we direct to thee through the defenders of thy Church, being severed from Sacerdotal rank and Catholic Communion, and from the number of the faithful."

The sentence was carried to Constantinople, and while Acacius the Patriarch was entering

the Church to celebrate the divine office, it was secretly appended to his robes. Then Acacius, backed by the Emperor of the East and the whole Church, retorted, defied Felix, and broke communion. This schism was not healed until after the death of Acacius in the year 518, when the Patriarch John his successor and five Papal legates once more communicated together in the Church of S. Sophia.

But it was a hollow truce, and did not last. In 726 came the edict of Leo the Isaurian, and the sacred images of the Church were everywhere broken and destroyed. The Popes of Rome supported the veneration of images, while the Patriarchs of the East, and the Sovereigns of Constantinople, with the exception of the Empress Irene, decreed their destruction. For a hundred and sixteen years this contest was carried on with alternations of victory on either side, and it was not until the year 842 that peace was declared, at the Council of Constantinople.

And thus we approach the middle of the ninth century.

Ignatius, son of the Emperor Michael, was elected Patriarch of Constantinople. He exercised his office with dignity and holiness, and gained the respect of all. But he dared to rebuke kings and the favourites of kings, after the manner of S. John the Baptist. Cæsar Bardas, the principal adviser and minister of the

emperor, lived in open adultery. Ignatius remonstrated, but in vain, and then excommunicated the royal offender. Cæsar Bardas was both an able minister and a powerful man, and it was not likely that he should succumb without resistance, or be thus disgraced without revenge. The deposition and banishment of the Patriarch was but the natural consequence of his faithfulness to the divine office which he bore, and in the year 858 Ignatius retired in exile to the Island of Terebinthus. But there was a most able scholar and philosopher named Photius, one of the most learned men of his age, holding a lay office as one of the ministers of State. Cæsar Bardas, though stained with crime against holiness, was yet a patron of learning, and moreover was the patron of Photius. Numbers of bishops and not a few expectant priests flocked round the Court of Bardas, and pressed their claims to the vacant Patriarchate. Although there had been in previous ages some few instances to the contrary, still it was the usual course that the Sacerdotal office should be undertaken before the Episcopal, and the Episcopal before the Patriarchal. But Bardas was a man who preferred learning and scholarship to any idea of the necessity of fitness for the spiritual office of a bishop; and of a sudden the Eastern world was astonished to find the learned Photius Bishop of Constantinople. A Council held at Constantinople in the year 861 confirmed this

election. Ignatius however, though exiled, was not defunct, and an appeal to Nicolas I., then Pope of Rome, rekindled the ancient quarrels of the East and West. In 863, Nicolas summoned a Provincial Council on the part of Ignatius, and the result was that the usual sentence of excommunication was passed against Photius. But this was not likely to be the end. On the contrary, it was but the beginning. The Eastern could hold a Council as well as the Western, and there was an Emperor in Constantinople, as well as a Pope in Rome. Letters of no gentle spirit, but breathing angry defiance, passed between the Emperor and the Pope, and Photius, by no means incapable of defending his rights, summoning his own Provincial Council, returned the excommunication which he had received, and in the year 866 publicly announced that Nicolas, Pope of Rome, was unworthy of the Communion of Christians.

What a miserable scene this presents to our view. Was Photius justified in his occupation of the Patriarchal Seat, Ignatius being still alive and wrongfully deposed? Was Nicolas justified in interfering with a Patriarchate in which, by the Canons of the Church, he had no authority? That was the question to be tried.

"The Roman Pontiff indeed alleged a specious pretext for acting with such violence, and exciting such unhappy commotions in the Church. This pretext was the innocence of Ignatius,

whom upon an accusation of treason, whether true or false, the Emperor had degraded from his patriarchal dignity. This, however, was not the true reason : ambition and interest were the real though secret springs that directed the motions of Nicolas, who could have borne with patience and viewed with indifference the unjust sufferings of Ignatius if he could have recovered from the Greeks the lost provinces of Illyrium, Macedonia, Epirius, Achaia, Thessaly, and Sicily, which the Emperor and Photius had removed from the jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff. Before he engaged in the cause of Ignatius, he sent a solemn embassy to Constantinople, to demand the restitution of those provinces; but the demand was rejected with contempt. Hence, under pretence of avenging the injuries committed against Ignatius, he indulged without restraint his own private resentment, and covered with the mask of justice, the fury of disappointed ambition and avarice." *

If this then be true as Mosheim describes it, we have the key to the whole history of that melancholy period, and it falls in but too well with the general character of those times when the aggrandisement of the Papal Chair was even more earnestly sought by increase of territory and temporal dominion, than by a spiritual eminence and holiness of life.

---

* Mosheim, Cent. IX., 11, 3, 27.

But a few years again passed away and another Emperor ascended the throne. Basilius the Macedonian assumes the government, recalls Ignatius from exile, and restores him to the Patriarchate. Then takes place, as it is designated by the Roman Church, the eighth General Council; which was attended by about one hundred Eastern bishops, and by three legates from Pope Hadrian II. It was Basil's policy at that time to gain the ear of the Pope, and therefore the Roman legates were treated with the most marked attention and respect. They took the first seats, while the legates of the Patriarchs of Antioch and Jerusalem sat below them. Photius was brought in, exhorted to submit himself to the Council and to retire to lay communion, but in vain. The Council terminated with the excommunication of Photius and his adherents, and in the triumph of the Papal Chair.

Now at last the troubles of the Church might seem to rest. The Greek Emperor at peace with the Pope of Rome, and the Bishop of Constantinople in communion once more with the whole Western Church. It sounded well, and seemed as though the Papal Supremacy had gained its end. But not so. Much yet had to be done. Ignatius departed this life, and his rival Photius was restored to the vacant See. Another Council was held A.D. 879, which deliberately annulled all that the preceding Council had said concern-

ing Photius, and the Pope's legates themselves stood by, and in the presence of the Eastern Patriarchs and no less than three hundred and eighty bishops, excommunicated all who refused to communicate with Photius. What are we to say now? Is peace restored on this side, as it had been before on the other? Is there any stedfastness? Is it TRUTH that these men are seeking, or the ascendency of worldly policy? Pope John VIII. rejects this very Council, in which his legates had presided, revokes his consent to their proceedings, and reiterates his excommunication of Photius. And thus the contest is pursued with alternate vicissitudes of victory. Wounds rankling still; jealousy and resentment still alive; the West claiming Supremacy; the East rejecting it, until at length the eleventh century approaches, bringing with it the great and final separation of the rival Churches.

It was towards the middle of the eleventh century that Michael Cerularius was Patriarch of Constantinople, and in the year 1053, being displeased with the practices or the doctrines of certain Latin priests, he wrote letters to the Bishop of Trani, in Apulia, in which he condemned several of the Latin customs, especially the use of unleavened bread in the Eucharist, which custom, as he affirmed, invalidated the nature of the Sacrament, and he commanded all the Churches within his jurisdiction to abstain from so erroneous a custom. Now there were at

that time many Latin monasteries within the Greek jurisdiction, and these Latin monasteries of course conformed to the Latin uses. They refused to obey the Dictates of Cerularius, affirming that the use of leavened bread was common in the Catholic Church, and not necessarily a subject of Episcopal order. Upon this refusal, coupled no doubt with other exasperating circumstances, Cerularius commanded the Latin churches to be closed. Leo IX. was then Pope of Rome. Upon his knowledge of this act of Cerularius, he published an answer, defending the Latin use against the Greek, and expostulating with Cerularius, as guilty of an unjustifiable act in closing the Latin churches.

"There are," he says, "both within and without Rome a great many Greek monasteries, or churches; none of these have been yet disturbed, nor prohibited from observing the customs of their forefathers. On the contrary, they have been advised and admonished to keep to them. It is known that divers uses, according to time and locality, are no hurt to the advance of believers, since it is one faith, working by love all the good it can, which recommends us to one God."

He then pursues at some length the usual arguments for the supremacy of S. Peter's Chair, in the judgment of such matters, and rebukes the vanity of those who dare to oppose it. He claims at least for the Latin churches a freedom in

these customs, and proves that our Blessed Lord Himself consecrated in unleavened bread.

Happy would it have been for the Church, if the Pope had gone no further than this; but he unfortunately placed the matter in the hands of one Cardinal Humbert, a man of fiery and controversial spirit. Humbert, accompanied by two other legates, proceeded at once to Constantinople, and there excommunicated, in the very face of the Patriarch, all who dared to speak against the holy Roman see. They laid the sentence of excommunication which involved the Patriarch himself and all his adherents upon the high Altar in the Church of S. Sophia, and shook off the dust of their feet against them. This soon reached the ears of the Patriarch, who immediately summoned a Council, and in return, excommunicated the Roman legates, and publicly burnt the Papal Act of Excommunication, which the legates had left upon the Altar. Now, fresh and fresh accusations rose up between the Churches, and fuel was added to the flame. The whole East supported Cerularius, the whole West supported the Pope. The Emperor for a time interfered, with the charitable hope of restoring union, but the Patriarch denounced even the Emperor as a Papist in disguise, absolved the people from their allegiance, and ultimately caused his dethronement, substituting another Emperor in his place.

Can such things come from the hearts of men professing Christianity? Can hatred, dis-

cord, and separation spring forth from the trifles which these opposing prelates urged against each other with such inveterate and persevering animosity? Could it be really supposed that the essence of the Holy Eucharist depended upon the use of leavened or unleavened bread; that rules concerning the celibacy or the marriage of the clergy should affect the vitality of a Church; that the Latins, by fasting on the Saturday, were out of the pale of salvation; that the chrism, or anointing in Baptism, should be reserved or not reserved to the Episcopal order; that bishops should wear or not wear a ring; that priests should or should not shave their faces; that Baptism should be observed by a single or by a trine immersion; can it be possible that the separation of Christendom has taken place (but such is the fact), in consequence of a variation of custom, or of opinion on such matters as these? * No! It was a deeper wound that was

* There is urged at the present day by the Roman Church against the Greek, the absence of the words "*filioque*" in the Nicene Creed. By which it is asserted that the Greeks are heretical, in denying the Procession of the Holy Ghost from *the Son*, as well as from *the Father*. But the Greeks have over and over again asserted their orthodoxy in this matter, and have proved that the difference is only *verbal*. The Greeks have always objected to the words "*filioque*" on the ground that they were not in the original symbol, as settled at Nicea, but were added by the Western Church subsequently. For accuracy in reciting the real Nicene Creed, one would rather side with

eating into the vitals of the Church than could arise from any such external trifles. It was the arrogance and ambition of rival potentates desiring to see which should be the greatest. It was the claim of the Roman Pontiff to the supremacy of the whole Church, resisted by the Patriarch of the East, who desired his freedom, knowing that both spiritual and temporal dominion was involved in the claim which was made. Gibbon describes it in his usual felicity of language.

"The darkness and corruption of the tenth century suspended the intercourse without reconciling the minds of the two nations. But when the Norman sword restored the Churches of Apulia to the jurisdiction of Rome the departing flock was warned by a petulant epistle of the Greek Patriarch, to avoid and abhor the errors of the Latins. The rising Majesty of Rome could no longer brook the insolence of a rebel, and Michael Cerularius was excommunicated in the heart of Constantinople by the Pope's legates. Shaking the dust from their feet, they deposited on the Altar of S. Sophia a direful anathema, which enumerates the seven mortal heresies of

---

the Eastern Church than the Roman, and certainly this refusal to use the words is perfectly justifiable. Such refusal was no ground of the final separation. On the contrary, the Greeks were for two centuries in full communion with the Roman Church, long after they had refused to use the words, and long before the final schism of Cerularius.

the Greeks, and devoted the guilty teachers and their unhappy secretaries to the eternal society of the devil and his angels. According to the emergencies of the Church and State, a friendly correspondence was sometimes resumed, the language of charity and concord was sometimes affected, but the Greeks had never recanted these errors. The Popes have never repealed their sentence, and from this thunderbolt we may date the consummation of the schism. It was enlarged by each ambitious step of the Roman Pontiffs. The emperors blushed and trembled at the ignominious fate of their royal brethren of Germany, and the people were scandalized by the temporal power, and the military life of the Latin clergy." *

And now let us review with impartiality this great historical fact of the final separation of the East from the West. If we look into the causes of it, we have equally to blame both parties, for both were filled with the same exciting tendencies of mere temporal ambition. Both raised up to the surface prelates whose mission seemed to be to destroy and disperse the love which their Divine Lord had said should be the mark of His discipleship. But we have not so much to do with the causes as with the fact. The Western Church embodied in Rome charges the East

* Gibbon, ch. lx.

with heresy. The Eastern Church retorts and reciprocates the charge. Both claim to be right. Both claim to be Catholic. Both throw the blame of the schism, the one upon the other.

The essence of the matter is, that the East has ever denied, and still denies, the Supremacy of the Pope. If that single point were allowed all other differences would melt away. But it is not conceded, and never will be; and because it is not conceded, Rome still holds forth against the whole East the anathema which was pronounced in the eleventh century. But what is this Church so held under anathema by Rome? True, she has been driven by Arabs, Saracens, and Turks from her fairest provinces; and Constantinople, which formerly gloried in the name of "New Rome," as sharing with her elder sister the empire of the world, is now the slave of the Mahomedan, and S. Sophia is a Turkish mosque; but even in this respect she may retort upon the West, in the vanished Churches of Africa, and say that Constantinople, Antioch, and Alexandria, are not worse than Carthage and Hippo. If the Chair of S. Chrysostom is silent and under a cloud, so also is that of S. Augustine and of S. Cyprian. But the Greek Church is not dead. She can point to the still existing bishoprics of many an ancient city. She prevails in an unbroken succession from the Apostolic times, more or less, in Russia, Siberia, Poland, European Turkey, Servia, Moldavia,

Wallachia, Greece, The Archipelago, Crete, Cyprus, The Ionian Islands, Georgia, Circassia, Mingrelia, Asia Minor, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. The most celebrated saints have sprung from her bosom. The most celebrated missionaries have gone forth out of her to convert the heathen. In the time of Photius, the whole number of the Eastern dioceses in communion with the Patriarch amounted to no less a number than 1029,* and certainly no greater number of sees could be found among the Western. She is therefore neither deficient in zeal, nor in sanctity, nor in extent. The faith of Christ, interpreted by the great Councils of the Church, is faithfully received by her, unvaried in any essential particulars, and in that faith she has gone forth from her ancient homes to propagate the Church throughout the nations. All Russia has been won to Christianity by her missionary labours. Yes! Russia, with her innumerable bishops and clergy, her civilised and enlightened people, and her powerful monarchy, forming at the present day the most formidable empire of the world, is the daughter of the ancient Eastern Church, and a witness of the Catholicity of the Mother from which she has sprung forth. And she has sprung forth *since the separation of the East from the West.* Whatever her faults may have been, whatever her sins, they are not

* See Palmer, "Treatise on the Church," vol. i. p. 164.

greater than those of Rome; and therefore she has not forfeited her ground of Catholicity, merely because she is out of communion with the Chair of S. Peter. There she stands, crippled indeed, and poor; but there she stands, the same Church, with the same system, with the same descent from the Apostles, with the same patriarchal seats of her government and jurisdiction, as she did when the Council of Chalcedon appointed her to rank with equal authority over the whole East, as that which Rome possessed at that time over the whole West. That rank and authority among the Churches she claims now, as she received then. That rank and authority she refused in the eleventh century, and she refuses now, to part with or cede to ancient Rome; because ancient Rome has no right by the Canons of the Universal Church to ask it.

On this then we dwell as the chief and great HISTORICAL FACT of the Church, winding up and concentrating all else within it, to prove that the Papal Supremacy is an unjust agression, and no true dogma of the Catholic Church. Let England be set aside. Let all we have said of the ancient British Churches deriving a descent, external and independent of anything connected with Rome, be forgotten. Let the Islands of the West be blotted out of the map of Catholic Christianity. Still, what is to be done with the East? What is to be done with the unchanged and unchangeable Churches of Asia, of Greece, and

of Russia? Are they also to be taken out of the history of the world and of the Church because they have denied, and still do deny, the Papal Supremacy? If not, what becomes of the truth of that dogma? If the East had never been separated from Rome we might have had a greater difficulty in disproving the assertions which that Church has so injuriously maintained against us. We should have had a greater difficulty, because in doing so we should have appeared to set little stress on the great principle of the Unity of the Church. But when the whole of the East, holding equally with ourselves this great principle of Unity; nevertheless, at the risk of seeming to break it, denies a dogma which another great portion of the Church assumes and enforces as the only condition of her communion; then, we are sure that the breach of Unity is not with that portion which denies, but with that portion which asserts, so great and unjustifiable a claim. We are sure, as a conclusion, inevitable from the mere fact of the existence of the millions of souls abiding in the faith of the Eastern Church, that the Supremacy of the West, as claimed by Rome, is a folly and a fiction.

CHAPTER XX.

However grievous a blow the great Schism of the East might have been to the Supremacy of the Popes, it would only be natural to think that at least, now that Constantinople had withdrawn and set up her own separate Church, Rome would be left to an undisputed dominion over the West. The unity of the Catholic Church as the one fold of Christ was indeed gone, and the Asiatic Churches, denying or despising the claims of the Roman bishops, were no longer to be considered. At least, then, Rome within herself would be one. The mighty claims of S. Peter's Chair, which had sounded so loudly throughout the world, would at least be sufficient to maintain an undisputed jurisdiction over her own territories; and Rome, delivered from her Asiatic adversaries, would now show the world what she really meant by the unity and the universality and the supremacy of Papal jurisdiction.

Under Charlemagne and his immediate successors the spiritual power of the Papacy, combined with and resting on the authority of that great prince, did indeed prevail; and during the eighth, ninth, and tenth centuries, there was little dispute with bishops who unscrupulously added to the pastoral staff the stronger arguments of the sceptre and the sword. The Popes became tem-

poral princes. At first, according to the feudal system of those times, they held their kingdom as a fief of their superior lord; and while the Frankish monarchs, successors of Charlemagne, retained their power, they were but little inclined to dispute his sovereignty. Nor, indeed, during the earlier reigns of the great German Emperors who succeeded to the dynasty of Charlemagne, was there any voice heard to dispute the immense powers of such kings as Conrad II. or Henry III. But the spirit of the Papacy was ever aggressive and vigilant of every opportunity. The idea had arisen that the spiritual office of a father in governing his children was identical with that of a king governing his subjects; and the most learned as well as the most humble of ecclesiastics were for ever occupied in the temporal ambition and the worldly policies of the subtlest of statesmen. Power, as the instrument of authority, was grasped by men who believed or asserted that they were disciples of Love, and it was thought necessary for those who had learned of a Divine Lord to "love not the world nor the things of the world," to enrol themselves among candidates for crowns, and to cast in their lot not so much among the Saints, as among "the rulers of the darkness of this world, and spiritual wickedness in high places."

But this was not without a contest. Henry IV. Emperor of Germany in the eleventh century, exercised the power as given him by his

ancestors, of nominating the bishops in his kingdom. During his minority rebellious vassals had shaken his empire by many civil convulsions, and he had enough to do to restrain, pacify, or subdue them. Not the least among his rebellious vassals—for till then, more or less, the Pope held his ecclesiastical states as a part of the empire—was the great Hildebrand, who became Pope of Rome under the name of Gregory VII. He was a man precisely fitted for the crisis in which he lived, and seemed to embody by talent and disposition, the essence of the Papal idea, that the spiritual dominion of a bishop was to embrace the lordship of the whole earth. By policy, first, and then by open war; by wielding alternately the spiritual weapons of excommunication, and the more tangible weapons of carnal force; by combining with enemies and betraying friends; by instigating rebellion and undermining obedience; Hildebrand at length established the Papacy as a royal kingdom over the heads of the German Emperors; and the world saw with admiration not unmingled with fear, a temporal sovereignty set forth in the centre of Italy, which represented the fisherman of Galilee, and the King who was "despised and rejected of men."

And thus we approach the twelfth century. The Popes were indeed "supreme." They asserted, and with various success maintained, their dominion; but the weapons by which they did so were carnal. They appear on the scene alter-

nately as political intriguers and military chiefs. In this light we behold Pascal II. contending with Henry V., and Hadrian IV. demanding of Frederick Barbarossa that he, though Emperor, should hold the Pope's stirrup as his vassal, in order that he might legitimately receive the ceremony of coronation. And thence wars arising, rival Popes, elected by contending parties demanding the Papal chair; and the great Emperor Barbarossa submitting his neck to be trodden under foot by the haughty Pontiff, Alexander III. Whether this was literally the case, or only a figurative description, historians dispute; but it was a sign of the times, even to assert it, and gives a key to the undoubted temporal power of the great kingdom of S. Peter. The maxim of the Church was now proclaimed without demur, that "the Bishop of Rome is the Supreme Lord of the Universe, and that neither princes nor bishops, civil governors nor ecclesiastical rulers have any lawful power in Church or State, but what they derive from him."

The thirteenth century brings us to Innocent III. who walked by no means unworthily in the steps of Gregory VII. He deals with the crowns of the kings of Europe as with toys; sets them up and puts them down at his pleasure; and as we read the history of this period, we are perplexed to say which is the greater subject of astonishment, the audacity of this extraordinary Pontiff, or the utter subjugation of such men as

Philip Augustus, King of France, and John Lackland, King of England, who both bowed their heads before him.

At length, however, the fourteenth century brings us to the climax. Boniface VIII., carrying forward his views of the Papacy even beyond the ideas of either Gregory VII. or Innocent III., met with an antagonist worthy to contend with him, in the person of Philip the Fair, King of France. This king at once resorted to the true rule of the Church, which had so long slumbered in abeyance. In the year 1303 he assembled the peers of his kingdom, and with the advice of Willian de Nogaret, a celebrated ecclesiastical lawyer, retaliated on the Pope with an accusation of heresy, simony, and other vices and crimes; demanding, for an examination of these charges, an Œcumenical Council. The aspect of affairs had now changed. Almighty God, as in all things else, had suffered this extraordinary power of the Papal See to work out His own good purposes. Those purposes being effected, the power was now to cease. In one man, as an earthly monarch, for more than two centuries, had the spiritual power of the whole Western Church been absorbed. But now it had run its course. In Boniface VIII., having arrived at its highest and most arrogant claims, the commencement of its declension is visible, and the first appeal to the ancient usages of the Church, a General Council, seems to cause it to melt

away. The Popes succeeding Boniface were men of a very different spirit from those who preceded him. They were appointed under the power of the French kings, removed their residence from Rome to Avignon, within the French territories, and became more or less the subjects and the creatures of the French Empire. Gregory XI. was one of these Gallican Popes, residing at Avignon. From thence governing the Church in the name of S. Peter, in the year 1370 he gathered courage enough to attempt a restoration of the Papal residence to Rome, but it was in vain. The Romans and the Florentines refused to accept him, and the successor of Hildebrand found himself a mere civil officer of the crown of France, with his ecclesiastical patrimony confiscated, and with the affections of his spiritual subjects a mere name. In 1378 he died, and the people of Rome, unwilling that the Papal chair should be filled by a Frenchman, insisted that an Italian should be chosen. They flocked to the conclave where the cardinals were assembled, and chose the Archbishop of Bari, a Neapolitan, saluting him with the title of Urban VI. But the cardinals withdrawing from Rome to Anagni, and thence to Fondi, elected to the Pontificate Robert, Count of Geneva, whom they saluted under the title of Clement VII., thus denying and invalidating the election of Urban. The two Popes respectively defended their claims and received their adherents; Clement residing

at Avignon as representing the French party, and Urban at Rome representing the Italians. France, Spain, Scotland, Sicily, and Cyprus, espoused the side of Clement, while the rest of Europe took the part of Urban. This is known in history as the *Great Western Schism*. It lasted from the year 1378 to the year 1428, exactly fifty years. Nor was it confined to these two rival Popes, or even to their direct successors, but it involved many minor schisms and complications by which the whole Church was continually disturbed. On the death of Urban VI. a successor was appointed on his side by his own party. On the death of Clement, a successor in like manner on the other side; while to crown the whole, the Gallican Church, incensed at the obstinacy with which each party, without regard to the utter dislocation of the Church, maintained its schism, assembled a Council at Paris, 1397, and dissolved all subjection and obedience to both Pontiffs, while the King of France detained Benedict XIII. as a prisoner in his palace of Avignon.

Now comes confusion upon confusion as we enter the fifteenth century: the Cardinals and ruling powers going from one side to the other; attempts made to induce one or other of the two rival Popes to abdicate; these attempts frustrated by the falsehood and the treachery of the Popes themselves; until we come at last to the summoning of the Council of Pisa, in the year 1409.

This would seem at first sight a happy thought! A Council! The Church will surely obey her own Council. The schism will surely now be healed. But no! on the contrary. Designed to cure the miserable wounds which were now eating into the vitals of all that remained of what was good and holy in the Church, this Council of Pisa was so far from doing so, that it only served to increase the schism, and to add fuel to the fire that was already raging.

"In the third session, held on the 30th of March, a decree of contumacy is promulgated against the two contending Popes, because being twice lawfully cited they did not appear, and those Cardinals who still adhered to them are invited to the Council. In the tenth, eleventh, and twelfth session, held on the 30th May, thirty-seven Articles against the contending Popes are publicly read, and being proved by fit witnesses, are openly declared by the Synod. In the fifteenth session, on the 5th of June, the sentence is passed, by which Peter de Luna (Benedict XIII.), and Angelus de Corario (Gregory XII.), are declared schismatics, heretics, perjured, and contumacious, and according to the sacred Canons removed from their government, and cut off from the Church, and all the faithful are absolved from their obedience." *

* Cave, "Hist. Literar.," tom. ii. p. 227; Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. p. 86.

Then came as a necessary consequence the election of a new Pope; and the election fell upon Peter of Candia, who assumed the name of Alexander V. But was it likely that the Popes so deposed should tamely relinquish their claims? By no means. All the decrees and anathemas of the Council of Pisa, in their estimation, and in that of their respective adherents, were utterly void, and therefore repudiated. And while each of the other two Popes still carried on the government of his own section of the Church, the only advantage of the Council seemed to be this; that it added a third Pope to the two already existing. Benedict XIII., the French Pope, summoned a Council at Perpignan; Gregory XII., the Italian Pope, summoned a Council at Aquileia. They each rivalled the other; they each claimed their subjects; and they each were the Head of the Church. Alexander V. died at Bologna in the year 1410, and sixteen cardinals immediately assembled, continued the schism, and elevated Balthasar Cossa, a Neapolitan, a man utterly destitute of religion and of talent, and placed him at the head of their third party, under the name of John XXIII. So things went on to the year 1414, and then we begin to hear rumours of *The Reformation*. No wonder. Symptoms appear of some few good and holy men still remaining in the Church who anxiously demand a purification of these fearful abuses—a reformation as they said, in expressive terms, of "the whole Church,

both *as to the Head and the Members.*" The name of Wickliffe was beginning to be heard, and of John Huss, and Jerome of Prague; signs that the evils of this miserable schism were already telling upon the hearts of the faithful. Men, not knowing where to turn, began to search for truth in pastures outside of the Church, since the Church herself, torn with schism, would not give it them.

"The rulers of the Church, who lived in luxurious indolence, and in the infamous practice of all kinds of vice, were obliged to hear with a placid countenance, and even to commend their bold censors, who declaimed against the degeneracy of the Church; who declared that there was scarcely anything sound either in its visible head or its members, and demanded the aid of the secular arm and the destroying sword to lop off the parts that were infected with the grievous and deplorable contagion. Affairs in short were brought to such a pass, that those were deemed the best Christians, and the most useful members of society, who braving the terrors of persecution, and triumphing over the fear of man, inveighed with the greatest freedom and power against the Court of Rome, its lordly Pontiff, and the whole tribe of his followers and votaries." *

What a scene this was! John XXIII. was

* Mosheim, Cent. xv. Part II. ch. ii.

now Pope of the third party, derived from the Council of Pisa, but the two others still maintained their claims, and carried on the schism. Sigismund, King of France, and the other Princes of Europe, determined upon a new Council; it was to meet at Constance, and John XXIII. was to summon it. They all agreed as to the legality of the Council of Pisa, but most were of opinion that John XXIII. should renounce the Pontificate, as well as Gregory and Benedict; but

"Those who were not of this opinion said that this was to impeach the authority of the Council of Pisa, and to treat a lawful Pope, who was never suspected of heresy, like deposed schismatics; that nobody could force him to renounce his right, and he himself could not renounce it, without injury to his own reputation, the authority of the Council of Pisa, and the Church whereof he was the lawful head." *

But still the Council was to meet. It did meet, and commenced its labours in the year 1414. First, it had to decide who should be Pope—whether, in fact, there was any Pope at all; and secondly, it had to decide as to a crowd of heretics who were swarming within the Church—the necessary offspring of their own dissensions.

But of this we must delay to speak at present. Sufficient for us now to view the sad history of

* Dupin., Cent. xv. tom. v. ch. ii.

the Councils of Pisa and Constance, and to gather from them some one or two conclusions as to the dogma of the Papal Supremacy.

I. True, that from the latter part of the eighth century, the times of Pepin and Charlemagne, the Papal power had begun to be enriched or encumbered with territorial authority, and had taken its place among the kingdoms of the earth. True that from the eleventh century down to the close of the fourteenth, under the rule of Hildebrand and his successors, the Papal power took not only its place, but took the first place, and ruled with a rod of iron over the kings of the earth. True that, as men count glory, the glory of the Church, her dominion, her irresistible power, the ambition and the ability of her prelates, was the main and conspicuous feature of the history of those ages. But was *that* the fulfilment of the divine mission? Did JESUS, the CHRIST, come upon the earth to teach that His Church was to assume the lordship of the world, and to contend in the person of her bishops with warriors, and statesmen, and kings, not only in the council chamber but also in the battle-field? Does Gregory VII., Innocent III., Pascal II., or Boniface VIII. present an appearance to the eye of the candid reader of GOD'S Word, of the fulfilment of the mission of peace, of love, of humility, and of holiness? If the Papal Supremacy depends for its establishment or its proof upon a period of

history such as this, stained with the annals of blood and war, will the Romanist accept it as coming from God when it thus bears on its very face everything contrary to God? It has its glory, and may be, in some things its bright passages, in the fact of an assertion of the spiritual power over the heathenism and darkness of a benighted world; but the means of its prevailing being the carnal weapons of the very enemy with whom it was dealing, its truth as coming from God is to be questioned, if not denied.

II. But let all that can be said be granted; what becomes of the issue of it? Its very glory, great as it was, eventually died out, and then came its collapse and its death. Could that which came from God die? If the ruling of the Papacy as such, over the temporal things of man as such, *by means of carnal weapons*, had been of God, would it have ceased; would such have been the issue of it as we see in the great historical fact of the disruption of the whole of Western Christendom, contending on the very point at issue?

The Pope, says the Romanist, is the Head of the Church, the supreme head, the visible head. It is impossible, says the Romanist, that there can be a Church without a visible head, and that head must be supreme. But there were from the year 1378 to the year 1428, sometimes two visible

heads, somtimes three, and the whole Church is formed into a triple league of opposition, discord, and dispute as to which part is the head and which the members.

It is a beautiful theory, it is a fond picture of the imagination, it is a delightful realisation of the prayer of our Blessed LORD, that the Church should be One; that there should be no schism in the body; that there should be many members but one Head; but if we make that one head to depend on the Supremacy of a Roman Bishop, we find our theory melting into an empty dream. There was first the miserable dissension between the whole East and the whole West. We put that aside—we give it up. Let the rulers of the East be one Church and the rulers of the West be another Church. Let the East be given up; we fly to the West. *There* at any rate we shall realise the beloved idea, and the Pope of Rome shall be our sole supreme governing Head. But lo, he melts away; he dissolves himself; he becomes THREE; and with, as far as poor human fallible eyes can see, an equal claim, he rules the Church, being one head, in three distinct opposing portions! We may deplore, we may lament, we may weep; but we must abandon our beloved idea. As the Pope of Rome contended for centuries with the Bishop of Constantinople as to which should be the sole and supreme head; so the Pope of Rome contends *with himself*, and for fifty years leaves the Church to find out as she

can where he is, if indeed he exist at all. Alas! Not being known to himself, he cannot well be a supreme and a visible head to others.

CHAPTER XXI.

The Council of Pisa had been called together to heal the schism of the rival Popes, Benedict XIII. and Gregory XII.; but instead of allaying, it increased the divisions of the Church by adding a third claimant of the Papacy in the person of John XXIII. Resort was therefore to be had to a new Council, which should take more vigorous steps in distinguishing between the authority of the Church, represented in Council, and that of the Pope elected by the cardinals. Rival parties among the cardinals had elected two different Popes, a Council had elected a third. There was no advantage to be gained in merely contending for the rival claimants; a deeper principle had now to be decided, namely, in whom and where was contained the seat of power in the election. Who was to be the judge of the validity of the election when the election was thus divided? Were the Popes themselves, each in his own division, to be judges of themselves? That would seem absurd, for each, according to the Roman system, being invested with the infallible power of discerning truth, and armed with supremacy in defending it, would decide for his

own authority, and his decision would be binding. Consequently, in this case there would be before the world three opposite truths, which, though contradicting each other, would be equally valid; and either there would be no necessity for a Pope at all, or the Church must no longer be considered one, but threefold. Indeed the destruction of the whole faith of JESUS CHRIST seemed impending, and in the disputes of the Headship the members were well-nigh cut off and scattered. Bossuet says—

"To such a pitch was discipline neglected, that heresies began to spread, and the Church was shaken to pieces by the wickedness of Huss, Wickliffe, and others. The faith was endangered. The Apostolic See, which should have been the cherisher of unity, was now the nurse of schism, and was held in contempt. The severe letters of the University of Paris, written to Clement VII. when at Avignon, testify to this, while they declare that, to such a height had things now come, on account of the schism, that many men both publicly and in every place were no longer afraid to say that it was no matter whether there were two, three, or ten, or even twelve Popes."*

And thus the Council of Constance arose. Here the great battle was to be fought; here it was to be decided, not so much whether either of the three claimants were the true Pope, but

* Bossuet, "Defen. Cler. Gall." lib. v. cap. 7.

whether the Universal Church represented in Council were not the sole legitimate authority, by which such disgraceful scenes as were now disturbing the Church should be terminated.

But as the Council proceeded a fresh difficulty arose, for accusations were brought against John XXIII. which implicated him not only in being the head of one of the threefold schisms, but as guilty of sins and vices of the gravest immorality. These charges were pressed against him with such undoubted evidence, that he was induced after some delay to make a promise that he would resign his share of the Papacy, and so open the way for a clearer judgment in regard of the other claimants. But this promise was no sooner made than broken; he escaped from the Council disguised in the dress of a postilion, and took refuge in the castle Schaffhausen. From thence, secure as to his person, he defied and denied the authority of the assembled Fathers, and maintained his rights. This flight of John XXIII., who was hitherto supposed to be in favour of the Council, brought things to a crisis. It was now to be determined who should be head, the Pope or the Council, whether schism should still be suffered to divide the faithful at the instance of self-willed and ambitious individuals; or whether there really were any inherent vitality in the Church, as CHRIST'S Body, over and above the personal power claimed by those individuals. In the fourth session of the Council,

the Emperor Sigismund being present in person, among other things it was decreed that the Pope was bound to renounce the Pontificate in all cases wherein his renunciation might bring peace to the Church, and that in such cases he was bound to agree to the declaration and definition of the Council; and that if the Pope, being required by the Council to renounce the Pontificate for the peace of the Church, would not, or should delay to do it, he ought to be looked upon as one that had fallen from the Pontifical dignity, and to whom no further obedience was due. It was also clearly defined and determined as a general principle of the Church, that "the Council having been lawfully assembled in the name of the Holy Spirit, and forming an Œcumenical Council of the whole Church militant, hath received authority immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ, a power which every person whatsoever, of whatever state or dignity he may be, the Pope himself not being excepted, must obey in all matters relating to faith, the extirpation of schism, and the reformation of the Church."* These principles being decided, the Council proceeded to apply them to the case before them. In the tenth session, the commissioners appointed for the purpose delivered in their report, in which they agreed that the charges against John

* Such is the substance of the decrees of the fifth session. Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. pp. 254, 255.

had been proved. He was cited to appear before the Council, and failing to do so he was publicly pronounced unworthy of the Papacy. It was decided that he had brought scandal upon the Church by his corrupt life, by simony, "by destroying and wasting the property of the Church, and by his dissolute and immoral habits;"* consequently he was deposed from the exercise of his spiritual offices as Pope, and the faithful of the whole Church were absolved from all allegiance to him. The justice of this sentence he did not deny, but recognising the Council as superior to himself, delivered up the seal and ring of the Papacy, together with the insignia of his office to their custody, merely entreating them to take measures for his subsistence as a private individual.

Meanwhile by a happy coincidence, Gregory XII., moved by a better spirit than that of John, had sent to the Council a voluntary resignation of his claim, so that John XXIII. and Gregory XII. being thus removed, there now remained but one claimant still outstanding, namely, Benedict XIII. But it was no easy task to deal with Benedict. He was obstinate to the last degree. The Emperor Sigismund in person visited him at Narbonne. Kings, princes, bishops and people, all equally entreated him for the peace of the Church, to resign his claim; but to all he turned

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. p. 376.

a deaf ear, to the last he obstinately maintained his supposed rights. There was no resource therefore for the Council but to proceed against him as in the case of John. Accordingly in the twenty-third session proceedings of deposition were instituted with the accustomed forms and citations, and these were carried on without interruption until the thirty-seventh, when, at length, the Emperor Sigismund being present, sentence was pronounced. He was declared contumacious, condemned as a perjured person who had given scandal to the Universal Church, a schismatic and a heretic, and therefore unworthy of all title, honour, and dignity in the Church—deprived of all right to the Pontificate and separated from the communion of the faithful. Moreover all persons, of whatsoever quality or condition, were forbidden to obey him under penalty of being dealt with as abettors of schism and heresy.*

Thus then, through much trouble and never-ceasing bitterness and contention, at length the ground was cleared, and the Church being delivered from the opposition of three rival Popes, it only remained to name and consecrate some one to succeed. In the forty-first session the Council proceeded to do this, and their choice fell upon Otho de Colonna. Having been duly elected and consecrated, he presided during the remaining session of the Council, under the name of Martin V.

* Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. p. 837.

And this business being happily completed, there was at last an end of the great Council of Constance.

But the objects of the Council were not altogether achieved. The Papacy indeed was settled, but there still remained the great question of the Reformation of the Church. It had been now for many years the general demand of Christendom, that the whole Church, "both the head and the members," needed an entire purification, and it was promised in the last session of the Council of Constance that this should be done. Martin V. specially took upon himself to convene another Council within five years with this view. But time passed on. The usual unwillingness of persons in authority to rectify abuses prevailed even with Martin V.; and he who had so long witnessed the evils of the former schism, and had in his own person been chosen to remedy them, was reluctant to use the means which were so evidently demanded, and to fulfil the promise which he had so solemnly made. The period of five years had extended to thirteen, and then at length the zeal and determination of the reformers prevailed over the indolence or the excuses by which the Pope desired to postpone the promised meeting. It was at first summoned at Pavia, thence transferred to Sienna, and again ultimately to Basileia or Basle. But it was not permitted that Martin V., though he had convoked the Council, should be present at it, for he

died on the twenty-first of February, 1431, while the Council was summoned to meet on the twenty-third of July.

Eugenius IV. being quietly and canonically elected, succeeded Martin, and at first he appeared to coincide with the views of those who desired a reform in the Church, and took part in the assembling of the Council. Activity and zeal pervaded all parties, and great hopes were entertained of a speedy termination of the Church's troubles. The real character, however, of Eugenius had yet to be discovered, and it was soon perceived that at heart he was as bitter an opposer of the authority of Councils as any of his predecessors had been in the fulness of their power. A struggle similar to that which had taken place at Constance now commenced at Basle, and Eugenius declared either for the dissolution of the Council, or at least its transfer to another place. But nothing was conceded. The old dispute broke out in all its vehemence. The question was—Where lay the seat of authority? Was it in the Pope or was it in the Council? The fourth and fifth sessions were appealed to, recited, and enforced. Eugenius was informed through his legates that he had no power as Pope to dissolve the Council, being himself subject to their authority and not they to his; that the Church in her aggregate capacity, and she alone, enjoyed the privilege of infallibility, therefore she alone could make rules which should be

binding on the faithful. 2. That Œcumenical Councils as representatives of the Church "*deriving their power immediately from our Lord Jesus Christ*," are therefore infallible, because *they are the Church*. 3. That the Pope, although the chief minister of the Church, is not above the Church, but the reverse; for while the Church cannot err in matters of faith, experience shows that the Pope, albeit the head of the body, can and does very often err; and moreover as a matter of fact, the Church as the mystical body of CHRIST, has frequently deposed Popes when convicted of errors in faith, while no Pope ever pretended to condemn the Church; which fact at once demonstrates the superiority of the one over the other. In this spirit of opposition session after session passed on, the Pope neither revoking his Bull for the dissolution of the Council, nor appearing in person, nor by deputy; until in the 12th Session, patience being exhausted, he was required to submit to the Council within sixty days, or be pronounced contumacious. The sixty days having passed, and all the forms of citation being exhausted, he was then openly deposed. Thirty-nine prelates and about three hundred ecclesiastics of the second order pronounced his deposition in the 34th Session, June 25th, 1439. They declared him to be—

"Contumacious and disobedient to the commands of the Universal Church, one that persists

in rebellion, a violator and contemner of the holy synodical canons, a disturber of peace and unity, one that gives open scandal to the whole Church, simoniacal, perjured, incorrigible, schismatical, heretical, obstinate, and a destroyer of the rights and revenues of the Church, a bad administrator of the Roman Papacy, and unworthy of all title or degree of honour and dignity. They forbad him to take upon himself the title of Bishop of Rome, or to execute any functions belonging to it, and prohibited all Christians, of whatsoever class or quality, to obey him, declaring all that he might have done contrary to their decision to be null and void."*

They next proceeded to the election of a new Pope, their choice falling upon Amedeus, Duke of Savoy, and on the day after the forty-first Session, Amedeus was first consecrated bishop by the Cardinal of Arles, and crowned Pope under the name of Felix V.

Thus then, again was the whole Church rent in twain, and two rival Popes claimed authority. The Council of Constantinople had healed the breach made by the Council of Pisa; but fell in its turn beneath a fresh schism created by the Council of Basle. The greater part of the Church adopted the side of Eugenius, as more particu-

* Dupin, "Hist. Eccl.," Cent. xv., cap. 3. Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. p. 1265.

larly Charles VII., King of France, to whom both parties had solemnly appealed; but the University of Paris, with many others in several kingdoms and provinces, adopted the cause of Felix, declaring him to have been canonically elected. It was a schism even more grievous than the former, for whereas before, it was a contest between rival Popes alone, it was now a contest between Council and Council. On one side stood the Council of Ferrara, and afterwards that of Florence, summoned by Eugenius; on the other side stood the original Council of Basle, deposing Eugenius, and electing Felix. And this schism remained open until the death of Eugenius, when he was succeeded by Nicolas V., and Felix then retired to his former monastery on the banks of the lake of Geneva.

And now what shall we say in review of this most disastrous period of Church history?

1. In regard of the Unity of the Church under the Papal system. Let us admit that every concession should be made, every sacrifice freely offered, for so great a boon as Unity; and therefore, whatever might be our objection theoretically to the concentration of universal power in the hands of one man—still, if Unity and Peace should be achieved by it, such objection should be waived. But in reviewing the history of the Council of Pisa, of Constance, and of Basle, with the opposing Councils of Ferrara and Flo-

rence ; reviewing the history of the various Popes, with their cardinals, princes, and bishops, who appear so prominently on the scene, do we find this Unity maintained ? In the idea of the one incorporated body under the one visible supreme head, do we really find the peace, the love, or the harmony which divines delight to paint, as the result of the Papal system ? Putting aside the Popes themselves, their own personal ambition, their own personal thirst for power, their excommunication of each other, their bitterness of spirit, their preference of their own personal pre-eminence, to the welfare of the Church, what are we to say of the whole body, and the members of the Church at large ? People against people ! Kings against kings ! Bishops against bishops ! Doctors against doctors ! Promises made only to be abandoned ; laws made only to be broken ; anathemas, excommunications, accusations, and curses from the mouths of men assembled to deliberate about the Peace and Unity of CHRIST'S holy and Catholic Church. And all this while, let the reader remember, heresies were in abundance outside the Church, just in consequence of these divisions. Huss, Wickliffe, and Jerome of Prague were subjects of anathema, and of the fire of the executioner, because they presumed to dispute the authority of these men, who thus were at discord internally among themselves. While men quarrelled in their Councils as to the power or the authority of the Pope, and

scrupled not to call him schismatic, heretic, and perjurer, they yet could turn round and unite as one power to destroy another, who bore the same name of heretic, only in another guise. To preserve a forced agreement in external appearance, the Pope and every contending Council would cheerfully unite; to prove real harmony and love among themselves, there was not the slighest attempt in foregoing any advantage, or conceding any demand. It was not the contest of Protestants against Romanists, or the battle of liberal opinions against ancient prejudice, for at that time Luther had not appeared, and Calvin was not known; but it was the contest of the children of the same family contending with each other, and destroying each other with merciless pertinacity, while all the while they held forth to the world the doctrine of their Unity and Love under one supreme head.

2. But in point of fact, these repeated Councils of the fifteenth century do in themselves invalidate and destroy the whole claim of Papal Supremacy. They are the collected and expressed opinion of the Church, after an experience of many centuries, in which that dogma had been practically enforced, to the effect that it was dangerous, unsound, and untrue. Their very institution and existence is with the object of testing its truth; and the deposition and

excommunication of Pope after Pope by the Church represented by their voice, is a result which lives in Church history as a fact up to this day. A whole series of writers in the Roman Church are brought forward to attest it, both writers of the period to which we refer, as Gerson, and writers of a subsequent period, more especially the learned Bossuet. Dupin, referring to the celebrated decrees of the 4th and 5th Sessions of Constance, writes thus :—

"The decree made in these two Sessions concerning the authority of the Council above the Pope, did plainly decide the question, and subjected the Pope as to faith and as to morals to the judgment of a General Council. And this ought not to be understood only of a time of schism, or in a case where the Pope is doubtful, but generally and in all other cases. 1. Because the words of the Council are general; 2. Because they import that all the world, even the Pope himself, is obliged to obey the Council, not only as to what concerns the extirpation of the schism, but also as to the Reformation of the Church in its head and members; 3. Because they speak not only of this particular Council lawfully assembled; 4. Because they contain general penalties against all that should not obey the Council of whatsoever dignity they might be; 5. Because they deduce the authority of the Council above the Pope from its representation of the Church, and from its infallibility

—and this belongs to all General Councils, at what time soever they were celebrated; 6. Because the Council acknowledges John XXIII. for lawful and undoubted Pope." *

Bossuet also says:—

"Those who were against the schism, especially the University of Paris, to which the whole Church looked up as the author of Peace and the fountain of sound doctrine, declared thus: 'The Pope, if he be Catholic, is placed under the authority of his mother, *i.e.* the Holy Church, which is evidently the mother of all the faithful; he is so placed by the maternal law, even as CHRIST was subject to His mother.'"*

And then after reciting several instances, where the Pope has been subject to a Council, he says:—

"Hence it appears how untrue they are who think that the opinion as to the higher authority existing in Councils arose first on the occasion of this schism, and who say that appeals to a General Council were a new thing which the urgency of the case derived from the schism then first brought forward. They do not remember that the King of France and the whole kingdom with all orders of men, did appeal from Boniface VIII. to a future Council, and as we shall relate in its right place, there were celebrated appeals

* Dupin, "Eccl. Hist." Cent. xv., cap. 2.

from the most catholic of Churches, the Anglican, in ages prior. But to omit these and still more ancient instances, and to take the cases just recited, we have seen an appeal put in from Gregory XII. to a General Council, as *that by which and in which the acts of Popes are accustomed to be judged*. It was for this reason that they appealed to the higher power as being a *customary matter*, not as a thing recently thought of, by reason of the schism, nor did they acknowledge that they appealed to the Council from this specific Pope as a doubtful one, but generally and altogether; and the two obediences, *i.e.* the whole Catholic Church, acknowledged the superior power of the Council, in which power alone the consciences of the faithful might rest in peace." *

In fact, the very words of the fifth Session of the Council of Constance decide this point at once. The words are these—

"This sacred synod constituting the General Council of Constance . . . . declares, that whosoever of any condition, state, or dignity, *even the Papal*, shall contumaciously refuse to obey the statutes, ordinances, and precepts of this sacred synod, *or of any other General Council lawfully assembled*, unless he repents, he shall be subject to the punishment he deserves." †

---

* Bossuet, "Def. Declar. Cleri. Gallican," lib. v. cap. 9. See also for instances of appeals, lib. x. ch. 25.

† Labbe et Cossart, tom. viii. p. 258.

And this is repeated in the Council of Basle.

But it is now time that we conclude this remarkable scene. And what are we to say? If we can say nothing more, we can say this; that a denial of the Papal Supremacy is not a new thing in the history of the Church. Most assuredly it is not to be confined under the idea of its being the fruit of mere Protestantism. It is not to be set down to the disgrace of the Reformation, or to be accounted the sign of heresy and schism, peculiar to the English Church of the present day. It has formed the battle-field, as we have perceived, of contending parties in the Church from the very beginning, *i.e.* from the time when first the political power of the Papacy gave any opportunity for its discussion, and it acquired definite and palpable shape when the contests and schisms of the Popes themselves reduced all idea of their own personal government to a positive absurdity. If we had nothing further in history to show than the Councils of Constance and Basle, we should be quite content there to rest our unwillingness to assent to the doctrine of Papal Supremacy. If we had no other century of contests between the East and West, between Constantinople and Rome, between Pope and King, and could only glance across the annals of the fifteenth century, we should read plainly enough in the triple headship of Benedict, Gregory, and John, as well as in the double

headship of Eugenius and Felix, that the dominion of one man in that which was the Church of many, was not the Will of God.

CHAPTER XXII.

The grounds upon which the Church in England is justified in rejecting the Supremacy claimed by the Bishop of Rome have hitherto been considered in regard of *Historical Facts*. Whether the Church at large, specially the Greek portion of it, and that which has been handed down to us among the Gallicans, and even in some instances the Italians themselves, were right or not right in asserting independence of the Papal See, has not been the question. The question has been one hitherto simply of fact. Has the Papal See in reality always exercised that supreme power which in theory she claims? We have found in point of fact that her Supremacy has been contested, denied, and subverted over and over again; that in *no case* in regard of the Eastern or Greek Churches has that Supremacy been exercised; that continually and from time to time throughout the West, the independence of the several bishops has been by the voice of Council after Council, proclaimed and established.

We are now about to pursue a different line of argument, and to show the same great result

from the internal spirit of the faith of JESUS CHRIST.

One of the notes of the true Church is *Sanctity*. It has been said in the Holy Scriptures, and is allowed in the universal teaching of Christian men, that "*Without holiness no man shall see the Lord.*" He Who came down from Heaven to found the Church was Himself the fountain from which all holiness was to be derived. He imparted it to His Apostles, and His Apostles to the Church, and the sign of its being essential to the existence of the Church as such, was the casting out by our LORD Himself of the traitor Judas, so that although an Apostle at first, no transmission of the Church was allowed through him. He had gone to his own place before the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT at the day of Pentecost had come upon the disciples. That HOLY SPIRIT, as containing the essence of Sanctity, flowed down into the whole body and members from the Head, which is JESUS CHRIST; and as there is not, and of course cannot be any Church which does not trace its succession up to the Apostles, so there is no Church which has not, as its distinctive mark, this holiness or *Sanctity*. "He gave Himself for us that He might *purify* unto Himself a *peculiar people* zealous of good works." (Tit. ii. 14.) This would seem so plain a truth that it were a waste of words to assert it. Our Baptism being appointed as the only way of admission into the Church, and that Baptism being the means and sign of

sanctification, it of course follows, that Sanctity is an essential note of the Church.

In this however, lest we fall into error, we must make a clear distinction; namely, that while the mark of the Church *as a body* must essentially be Sanctity, it is very possible that the members of the body in some of its parts may at the same time be deficient in that mark. Such deficiency in any of the members, though it weakens the body, does not destroy it; though it mutilate and dishonour it, does not cause its death. And in this way only we can account for the preservation of the *Church* as holy, although *individuals* are sinners. "The *will* of God," is the Sanctification of every soul in the Church. (1 Thess. iv. 3.) That will is fulfilled by the reception of every soul into its membership by Baptism, so that no one can ever be in the Church without *at some time* being holy, It is true the will of God is violated by the lapse of sinners. It is true that men fall away from holiness—some more, some less; some for a longer time, some for a shorter; some perhaps, altogether, finally, hopelessly. But this falling away of individuals does not hinder, but that the body still lives and keeps its general mark. It is ever fulfilling, teaching, contending for, and asserting the necessity of Holiness. Distinguish between these two things. All Scripture realises the possibility of imperfection in the members, the Sanctity of the whole being still intact; as more particularly the

parables of the wheat and tares, the draw-net, and the wedding feast. This being granted, we shall better understand the question of the "*Sanctity of the Papal power.*"

Now we look upon the history of the Roman See, and we find this Sanctity all along most fearfully violated. The most wicked and unholy men are found from time to time governing the Church from the Chair of the Apostle S. Peter.

"It is quite true; we readily grant it," say the advocates of Romanism; "but that fact does not militate against the truth of the claims of the Pope as supreme Pastor of the Church." And then, to corroborate this assertion, those arguments are brought forward which have just been mentioned, namely that individual lapses from sanctity do not hinder the Sanctity of the Church. "The battle of the Catholics in the fourth century," they tell us, "lay in this very point, that while the Donatists asserted the necessity of complete holiness, denying the existence of a Church which contained an unholy member; the Catholics, as represented by S. Augustine, S. Cyprian, S. Jerome, and many others of the most learned Fathers, conclusively proved that such a tenet was a heresy."

But there is no difficulty. In all this we most fully agree. The Donatists were undoubtedly heretics. There may be many, nay, there may be even a majority of sinful men within the Church. Common laymen and women may

abound to the scandal of the faith. Discipline may be lax, and doctrines may be erroneous. The very sacred orders of the Church in the deacons and priests may be violated by the intrusion or the fall of unworthy men; nay, even the very bishop himself may be an unholy man. He who rules over the Church in the diocese appointed for her government, may be like that evil servant, who in the absence of his lord begins "to smite his fellow-servants, and to eat and drink with the drunken." (S. Matt. xxiv. 49.) All this may be true, as alas it has been too often true; and so the Bishop of Rome as one of those rulers may have been guilty of every kind of sin; may have violated the order of the Church; may have desecrated the sanctity of her offices by every conceivable wickedness, and yet have remained within the Church. Yes; the Church in spite of any individual Pope may still have retained her Sanctity; may still have been, though mutilated and dishonoured for the time, nevertheless "the body of CHRIST."

But all that may be said in this manner is beside the question. When we argue about the "*Papal Supremacy*," we do not argue about the Pope as a member of the Church, as an individual soul, or an individual priest, or even an individual bishop; but we argue about him as to that particular power which is claimed for him over and above his individual membership, and distinct from any other bishopric in the Church

throughout the world. We argue about him, not as being a *member* of the Church, but as being according to the Roman theory, *Head* of the Church; as being in his own person the supreme ruler over the whole Church, as the *Vicar of Christ*, as the representative of the Divine grace, as containing in his power as well as his office the very attributes of the Godhead, so as to be infallible in the interpretation of truth, incapable of error; having authority to decree articles of faith, and that irreversibly; having dominion over all things on earth, both temporal and spiritual, so that without reference to the Councils of the Church or any other possible authority, his word should be as GOD'S word, the immoveable fiat of truth.

Now these are two very different things. What is true of the members of the Church, as such, joined together under the great Head of the Church, invisible, at the right hand of GOD in Heaven, no other than our Lord JESUS CHRIST, does not follow to be true of another as man on earth, claiming to be the *visible* head—and that not as a bishop or ruler in a single diocese, but ruler over all—as the perpetual representative, or vicar, or vicegerent of CHRIST. When we allow, according to the teaching of Holy Scripture, that bad men may be in the Church, it does not follow that we are to allow that there can be bad personal representatives of CHRIST, in the sense the Papal system claims the Bishop of

Rome to be. When we allow that individual souls may err from holiness and yet the Church remain holy, it does not follow that a man who claims the vicegerency of God can, consistently with such a claim, err from holiness and yet retain that vicegerency.

No. We cannot by any stretch of imagination, save that of downright insanity, picture to ourselves the character of our Blessed Lord on earth; His meekness, purity, gentleness, love, unspotted holiness, suffering, and purity; and then turn to the annals of the Papacy and behold what is there presented to our view; and say that the latter is the representation of the former; that every single bishop (for that is the theory) who has ever filled the chair of S. Peter, is not only the successor of S. Peter, but that he exercises the vicarial rights, power, inherency of truth, and infallibility of knowledge, of Jesus Himself; that he sits there, and has sat there all along these ages, speaking with the voice of Christ and of God. We may indeed, in some very great and devoted saints, such as have shone forth in the history of the Church, from time to time, imagine that we hear Christ speaking to us in the representation of His character. We might imagine it for instance in such men as S. Boniface the Apostle of the Germans, or S. Francis Xavier the Apostle of the Indies, men whose whole lives were dedicated to their Lord. But we cannot imagine that we see Christ, or

feel that no other than He is speaking to us, when the voice comes from a notoriously wicked, profligate, and sinful man, such as alas it will be our duty to show that the Papacy has produced.

But is it meant that the bishops of Rome are entirely of the latter class, and none of the former? By no means. There have been bishops of the Roman See of most saintly character, men of most exemplary and holy lives. But again, that is not the question. To prove the truth of the assertion conveyed in the dogma of the Papal Supremacy, we must ascertain that not some, but that *all* the Roman bishops have been of this saintly character; not a few as examples of individual lives; but that *all* officially, and by the very tenure of the Vicarial spirit of CHRIST have undeviatingly been holy men. There is no room for anything unholy in him who would come to us in His office as in person exercising the authority of CHRIST. At least, there must be such distinctive marks of holiness that we may be reminded without possibility of the MASTER whom such an one professes to serve.

This then is the question which we have now before us.

Under the general designation of holiness or sanctity would be included, in the first instance, *entire freedom from the world*. He who would imitate CHRIST, be of His Spirit, or in any way represent Him, must be entirely free from, and

independent of the power, the opinions, and the customs of men. "My Kingdom is not of this world. If My Kingdom were of this world, then would My servants fight that I should not be delivered to the Jews, but My Kingdom is not from hence." (S. John xviii. 36). Here is the key of the whole religion of JESUS CHRIST. A Kingdom certainly, even as He the Head is CHRIST a King, but entirely exclusive of the visible dominion of men. In another place He says, speaking of His Apostles who were to be the founders of His Church under Him, "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." (S. John xvii. 16.) And again, how awful is that picture which is given us of the great temptation of our LORD, when it appears as though the devil had summed up his greatest strength, in the attempt to bribe Him from the sanctity of His office as Messiah. "The devil sheweth Him all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them: saying, All these things will I give Thee, if Thou wilt fall down and worship me." (S. Matt. iv. 9.) In this attack of the tempter we behold at once both the danger and the sin of the world as Satan's possession in opposition to sanctity; and we behold in our LORD's reply His consideration of it as involving a spirit in direct opposition to GOD. The same truth is taught again at the close of our LORD's life, as thus it was taught at the beginning, for when He was now closely drawing near to His agony and

final contest with the evil one, He said, "The Prince of this world cometh, and hath nothing in Me." (S. John xiv. 30.) It seems as if, all along, Satan and the world, the lust of the world, the pride of the world, the dominion of the world, had been the principle of evil, antagonistic to His own as the principle of good. So then, this world is to be the object of danger to His Church. That which, coming from the devil, would have been a sin to Him, must be so to them to whom He commits His Church. His Church cannot be different to Himself. Those who represent Him must be as He was. Those who are His vicars, being apostles or bishops, evangelists or priests, must be as He was. Their power must be as His power, their lives as His life, their spirit as His Spirit. Did He teach or rule through the power of this world? If not, neither must they. Did He accommodate Himself in habits, or tastes, or opinions, to the world? If not, neither must they. Did He sit upon a throne, and from thence dictate His laws to the world, as a temporal sovereign, blending His Spiritual Supremacy with the dominion which cometh of the world? If not, neither must they.

Now let us see how this was.

For the first ages truly indeed did the Spirit of Christ, as in opposition to the spirit of the world, beam forth in the See of S. Peter; for she followed closer in the track of our blessed Lord's

own most holy steps. How glorious a Church Rome must have contained in those first days of suffering and of poverty. How red with the blood of martyrs were the stones of that ancient city, as from time to time each of her bishops fell in succession before the blow of the executioner, or the slaughter of the wild beasts. Behold in the following catalogue how one succeeded the other without flinching and without fear, as God was pleased to call them to their holy office.

	A.D.	
1.	66.	S. Peter. The first bishop. Crucified with his head downwards, under Nero.
2.	78.	Linus. Martyred under Vespasian.
3.	91.	Anacletus. Martyred under Domitian.
4.	100.	Clement. Martyred in the persecution of Trajan.
5.	109.	Evaristus. Martyred under Trajan.
6.	119.	Alexander. Martyred under Adrian.
7.	128.	Sixtus. Martyred under Adrian.
8.	138.	Telesphorus. Martyred in the first year of Antoninus Pius.
9.	142.	Hyginus. Supposed to be martyred, but not certain.

	A.D.	
10.	157.	Pius. He is placed in the Canon as a martyr, but some dispute it.
11.	168.	Anicetus. The same may be said of him as of Pius. Raban, Florus, and Anastasius suppose him to have died in the profession of the faith.
12.	176.	Soterus. Martyred in the reign of Marcus Aurelius.
13.	192.	Eleutherius. In his time the celebrated martyrdom of Lyons occurred. It is probable that he suffered also himself.
14.	201.	Victor. Martyred under Severus.
15.	218.	Zephyrinus. He probably died in peace after the death of Severus.
16.	223.	Callistus. It is said that he was kept prisoner in a private house, cruelly beaten every day, and at last thrown headlong into a well. He suffered under Alexander, but without his knowledge.
17.	230.	Urbanus. Beheaded in the reign of Alexander.
18.	235.	Pontianus. Banished to Sardinia by the Emperor Maximin, where he died.
19.	235.	Anterus. Suffered martyrdom a month after his election, under Maximin.

A.D.

20. 250. FABIANUS. Martyred in the persecution of Decius.

(Here the See of Rome was vacant for a year and four months, the Christians being imprisoned or so dispersed by persecution that they could not meet to elect a bishop.)

21. 252. CORNELIUS. All this time the persecution of Decius was raging, renewed after his death by Gallus. The Christians were ordered to sacrifice to the gods. Cornelius refusing, made a confession of faith, was first banished, then beheaded.

22. 252. LUCIUS. Sent with Cornelius into banishment, was elected bishop, returned to Rome and was beheaded.

23. 257. STEPHEN. Martyred in the persecution of Valerian.

24. 258. SIXTUS II. Valerian orders all bishops, priests, and deacons to be sought for, and executed without mercy. Sixtus being found, was beheaded with his faithful deacon, S. Lawrence. (The See vacant nearly a year, the Christians not being able to meet together for the election of a bishop.)

25. 269. DIONYSIUS. The persecution ceas-

	A.D.	
		ing, it is supposed that he died in peace.
26.	275.	Felix. The persecution beginning again under Aurelian, he died a martyr.
27.	283.	Eutychianus. Died in the reign of Probus; probably in peace.
28.	296.	Caius. Probably the same, though some of the martyrologies gave him the title of martyr.
29.	304.	Marcellinus. The great persecution of Dioclesian takes place at this time. Marcellinus is martyred.

(The See remained vacant about three years and-a-half. The Christians scattered and dispersed.)

30.	310.	Marcellus. The Church at peace; but upholding discipline in regard of those who had lapsed from the faith in the preceding persecution, Marcellus was banished by the Emperor Maxentius.
31.	311.	Eusebius. Suffered under the same tyrant Maxentius, after which time there was a vacancy in the See for about nine months.

What a scene of bloodshed and suffering is

here presented to our view! Thirty-one bishops, one after another have carried on the spiritual succession from S. Peter the Apostle; and they all with very few exceptions have but followed each other in the consecration of martyrdom. Truly indeed had our LORD said, that He "came not to bring peace, but a sword." And now at length we approach the end. The thirty-second Bishop was Melchiades, succeeding Eusebius in the year 311, and then it was that the ferocious tyrants of the preceding ages gave place to the more gentle and more politic Constantine, and the land had rest. It was in the year 313 that, Melchiades being bishop, it was allowed for the first time in the history of the Roman Empire, that a man might with impunity profess himself to be a Christian; the first time that a bishop, under the countenance of the law, might set forth the Cross as the symbol of his faith. The churches and other property of the Christians were now directed to be restored, and universal religious toleration was proclaimed as the theory of the future government of the Roman Empire.

It was a change, indeed. What that change effected in the history of the Church, and how the blandishments of worldly favour dimmed the lustre of the ancient faith, we shall have unhappily to record; but for the present let us dwell for a little on the past, let us pause for a little on the three first centuries, the golden age of the Church of JESUS. Look through the list of

the Bishops of ancient Rome thus given; from S. Peter to Melchiades. How many do we find, to whom it was permitted to die in peace? Look through the history of those ten great persecutions, under which the very profession of the Christian faith involved confiscation of all things that men hold dear on earth. Behold the holy Fathers, suffering men and women, tender children, hiding themselves from the violence of Satan, who stands out, personified in the rulers of the world from Nero to Diocletian. Behold them led to the prison, the sword, the cross, and the wild beast; and amongst them as holding the first place of responsibility, so holding the first place of suffering, behold the chief pastors of the flock leading on their brave disciples through much tribulation, even as CHRIST their LORD had taught, to gain a higher crown than earth could give. The catacombs dug beneath the sand, and stretching along for miles underneath the walls of ancient Rome, are the living witnesses even to this day of the sufferings of those holy men. There, in the secret caverns of the earth, they lived, they worshipped, and they died. There, to this day still remain the altars of rude stone, or sand; the little steps of ascent, the sedilia, and many of the very marks of the worship with which these holy bishops of whom we have spoken, in daily fear of death, professed and venerated CHRIST. There, too, scattered along the dark and crumbling walls of

sand, are the tombs of the dead, and not unfrequently spots of darkened blood, testifying that there, in those secret resting places, was once deposited the body of some martyred brother, or some holy Father of the Church.

Who can but say, reading these things in the lives of the past, that the first bishops of Rome were of a truth men "not of the world, even as CHRIST was not of the world." There is no glory there, but of Him Whom they loved; there is no praise there, but of Him Whom they served; there is no crown there, but His which was held out to them as they suffered in His cause, visible only to the eye of faith. Oh! holy and beautiful Church, such as He would have it; called out of the world; having nothing in common with kings; not dealing with the treasures which the prince of this world had to offer, but holding aloof, and training up souls for the higher things of heaven. Happy indeed had it still been so; happy, had it pleased Almighty GOD that the rulers of the world had ever kept their distinct and separate place, and suffered the disciples of JESUS to be untempted by their kingdoms. Happy had we all been at this our day, far happier, because far more holy, as "the little flock;" if it had so pleased GOD that states and governments, kings and emperors, had never corrupted the holy faith of JESUS, that King Whose distinct essence and mark it was, to be "not of this world."

CHAPTER XXIII.

In proportion as "the world," so far as it is embodied in the favour of kings, entered into the system of Christianity, the Spirit of Christ departed. The contest was to be between two antagonistic principles. If the antagonism had never been lost sight of, the Church had been saved; but it was Satan's device, as the "Prince of this world," to gain entrance into the Church, and so to destroy it. And this he did, not by an open and recognised enmity, but by a concealed friendship. Until Constantine first tolerated and befriended Christianity, the Church and the world were open foes, as Christ meant them to be; but upon his accession to the Empire, being in harmony with those higher views of the Church which presented themselves to a more enlightened mind, he became, or professed to become, even as Emperor, a disciple of Jesus. But then, the Church in this royal acquisition did not absorb the Emperor into herself, and impart to him the rudimental principle of her existence so as to be still "out of the world;" but he as Emperor brought down the Church to the level of himself, imparted to her the principles of his own previous and heathen life, and contaminated the purity of her system by his own system of the world. Christianity, depending

upon her LORD's teaching, had separated the things of Cæsar from the things of GOD; and up to the fatal reign of Constantine, that separation was keenly and vividly marked. Now, however, the line was broken through, and it was attempted too readily on the part of each to amalgamate and blend the two. It might have been love of truth, or it might have been worldly policy, we will not determine which, that on the part of Constantine imagined an incorporation of the Church with the State. It might have been love of the souls of men, or it might have been treacherous fear, we will not determine which, that on the part of the Christians throughout the Roman Empire imagined that the favour of kings would extend the blessings of the Church. But as we now look back and see from experience the issue of that fatal junction, we can assert, that as certainly as when you conjoin in one vessel fire and water, the one will go on contending till it destroys the other, so certainly will the Church in conjunction with the State go on in an everlasting contest, until the one extinguishes the other. In separate lines, parallel but never converging, as our blessed LORD has taught, they may co-exist, but in any union in one body they cannot live a day.

"Constantine and his successors could not easily persuade themselves that they had forfeited by their conversion any branch of the imperial prerogatives, or that they were incapable of giving

laws to a religion which they had protected and embraced. The Emperor still continued to exercise a supreme jurisdiction over the ecclesiastical order, and the Theodosian code represents under a variety of titles the authority which they assumed in the government of the Catholic Church. But the distinction of the spiritual and temporal powers, which had never been imposed upon the free spirit of Greece and Rome, was introduced and enforced by the legal establishment of Christianity. . . . . In the Christian Church, which entrusts the service of the Altar to a perpetual succession of consecrated ministers, the monarch, whose spiritual rank is less honourable than that of the meanest deacon, was seated below the rails of the sanctuary, and confounded with the rest of the faithful multitude. The Emperor might be saluted as the father of his people, but he owed a filial duty and reverence to the Fathers of the Church; and the same marks of respect which Constantine had paid to the persons of saints and confessors were soon exacted by the pride of the Episcopal order."*

It was a change indeed. Those whose dress and manners, whose habits and thoughts had never qualified them for the residence of a court, were now the companions of kings. Those whose voice had never been heard save with the cries of distress in the persecution of tyrants,

* Gibbon, vol. iii. ch. xx.

were now openly taking part in the councils of statesmen and warriors. Could poor human nature in such a change resist the fascinations of pride, or the delights of a luxurious repose? Could the world be brought in upon them without a temptation to take their share of it? The history which we now depict will answer these questions.

Boniface III. was Bishop of Rome in the year 607. In his time, Phocas, who was one of the most abominable tyrants that ever sat upon the throne of the ancient Roman Empire, made a grant of priority of rank to the See of Rome over that of Constantinople. Up to that period the Patriarch of Constantinople had been called by permission of the Emperors, *Universal Bishop*. Phocas now deprived him of that title, and conferred it solely upon the Bishop of Rome. This indeed in appearance conveyed a mere spiritual authority, but it was the foundation of that great temporal power to which in after times the See of Rome so wonderfully attained.

Boniface must have known how his predecessor, Gregory the Great, had rejected that title, as savouring of the world, calling it "vain, proud, profane, impious, execrable, blasphemous, unchristian, heretical, diabolical," and how that good and really patriarchal bishop had declared that whosoever should assume it was a "follower of Satan, a rival of Satan in pride, and the fore-

runner of Antichrist." Still, nevertheless, he assumed it; and the Popes of Rome have ever since adhered to it, and upon it they have based first their claim to spiritual, and next their claim to temporal supremacy. Such, then, was the first step in the worldly spirit of the Papacy.

Martin was Bishop of Rome in the year 649. The title of Universal Bishop, or bishop over all other bishops, conceded to Boniface, was now exemplified in act by Martin. A contest in the Church on the doctrine of there being two Wills in Christ had long disturbed the Church. Heresies had grown out of this, as the reader may more fully see by referring to Chap. xvii. p. 272, &c. Heraclius, the Emperor, was desirous to put an end to the disturbances which on this account afflicted the Church, and Sergius, Patriarch of Constantinople composed an *Ecthesis*, or Exposition of the Faith, by which all controversies on the question were prohibited. Most of the Eastern bishops adhered to the Ecthesis, but John IV., Bishop of Rome, A.D. 639, rejected it, as secretly involving, or by its command of silence compromising, actual heresy. Then came forth from the Emperor a new edict, known by the name of "*The Type*" or "*Formulary*," published by the Emperor Constans, in which silence on the controverted points were even more strictly enforced than it had been before. One hundred and five bishops assembled at Rome, under Martin, and publicly condemned both the Ecthesis and

the Type, thus setting the Emperor at defiance, no less than his patriarch. Martin held himself to be, according to the theory derived from Boniface, "Universal Bishop." On this ground he appointed one of the Eastern bishops, who was on his own side of the controversy, to be his *Vicar* in the East, and commanded him by his authority and in the name of S. Peter, to exercise all patriarchal jurisdiction in the East; not recognising those who governed there as lawful bishops. Here then was commenced a direct attack upon the spiritual power, and an indirect attack upon the temporal power. Heraclius, the Emperor, had no commission to interfere in the spiritual things of the Church. Martin, the Pope of Rome, had no commission to interfere in the temporal edicts of the Emperor. They mutually wronged each other, and shared the fruits of their wrong in the miseries of all. Martin foresaw at once that there would be a collision, and with the foresight of worldly policy which even then began to prevail as a necessary ingredient in the government of the Church, he made overtures to the Kings of France, Clovis and Sigebert, for defence against the Emperor. The Saracens were devastating the empire. An Exarch, or Imperial Governor, ruled in Ravenna. To this Exarch, the Emperor in all haste committed the charge openly of gathering an army for the defence of the empire against the Saracens, but secretly to seize the person of the Pope, and bring him

bound to Constantinople. Martin, whose bodily health confined him to his bed, caused himself at once, as he there lay, to be carried to the church of the Laterans. This was of no avail: he was made prisoner by the Exarch, put on board a vessel, and, in the midst of great bodily suffering, was landed at the island of Naxos. There he remained as prisoner in a private house one whole year; thence afterwards was taken to Constantinople, and publicly tried as a rebel against the authority of the Emperor. It so happened that Olympius the Exarch, to whose custody in the first instance Martin had been consigned, had been guilty of a secret design to conspire against the Emperor. And it was now brought as an accusation against the Pope, that he had not only treated with contempt and disobeyed "The Type;" in which, indeed, there might have been a defence, inasmuch as it was a spiritual matter; but that he also had joined in the actual conspiracy of Olympius, which was solely a temporal matter. In his defence, he said:—

"I will tell you the truth, if you are disposed to hear it. When the Type was first published and sent to Rome by the Emperor"—Here he was interrupted by the prefect, who said, "What Type? What have we to do with the Type? You are now questioned about crimes against the State, and not your belief. We are all Christians, and good Catholics." The Pope

answered—"I wish to God it were so, but I fear one day I shall bear witness against you in a more tremendous tribunal than yours." "But what an abandoned wretch art thou," continued the prefect, "when you knew that Olympius [the former Exarch, who it was supposed took the side of Martin] was scheming against the Emperor, not to offer to oppose him, nay, rather thou didst encourage and countenance him." Then the Pope concluded thus: "Was I in a condition to oppose a man who had all the soldiers of Italy at his command? Did I make him Exarch? Am I responsible for his conduct? But dispose of me as you please, and as soon as you please, for great will be my reward in Heaven." But he was found guilty, and the judge summed up thus—"Thou hast conspired against the Emperor, and God has abandoned thee, and delivered thee up into our hands." *

And upon this he was stript of his garments, and delivered up to the governor of Constantinople to be put to death; then placed in a dungeon among murderers and criminals, where he remained eighty-five days. But in the end his life was spared; spared, however, for still further sufferings; not only persecuted by his enemies at Constantinople, but forgotten and forsaken by his friends even at Rome. Thus he

* See Baronius, Annal. 651, p. 432.

writes in the spirit of meek complaint to a private friend, describing his miserable state :—

"We are separated from the rest of the world, and deprived in a manner of life itself. The natives here are all pagans, and those who come from other parts and settle among them adopt their manners, are destitute of all charity, and strangers even to that pity that is to be met with among the barbarians. Nothing is brought to this country but by the vessels that come, and they come very seldom, to load salt; so that, the present month of September, I have found nothing to buy but one bushel of wheat, and that I have bought at a most exorbitant price. I am amazed at the entire want of compassion which all have betrayed who were any ways connected with me. They have all so absolutely forsaken me, that they know not, nor do they care to know, whether I am dead or still living. But I am most of all surprised at the behaviour of those who belong to the Church of the Apostle S. Peter, in not supplying one of their own order even with necessaries of life. If that Church has neither gold nor silver, it wants not, God be thanked, corn, wine, and other provisions, of which they might have sent us, in our present distress, at least a small portion to keep us from starving. What fear has seized on all men, and made them neglect the commands of their Creator? Have I been an enemy to that Church, or do they now look upon me as an enemy? But may God, by the inter-

cession of S. Peter, keep them all steady in the Catholic Faith, especially the pastor who governs them at present, that they may receive with me the reward that is promised to those who, in spite of all temptations, persevere to the last in the Orthodox Faith. As for me, I am in the hands of the LORD, who, I hope, is near at hand, and will soon put an end to my life and sufferings." *

This letter was written in the beginning of September, and on the 16th of the same month, worn out with hardships and privations, he died, seemingly abandoned by all.

Now, in this history of Martin what do we find? In the character of the man we find the most undaunted courage, the most persevering patience, and the whole temper and spirit of the ancient martyrs of the Church, who died before the time of Constantine. But, alas! that spirit was now mingled and tainted with the world, and the ambition of temporal greatness. It was the first great battle between the spiritual and temporal power. It was a contest by which it was to be determined whether the Emperor or the Pope was to be supreme. There was grievous wrong on both sides. Whether Martin actually did connive at the treasonable practices of the Exarch Olympius against the Emperor, it is diffi-

---

* Baronius, Annal. 651.

cult to say; but that he set himself forth as to "The Type," an opposer of the Emperor, is perfectly clear, when he called that edict "*wicked and in every respect impious.*" Whether he was justified, as Bishop of Rome, in thus expressing himself in regard of a spiritual matter, upon the consideration that the Emperor as such had no commission to dictate an expression of faith, is a distinct question. In all probability, there was right and there was wrong in each of the questions. How this was, it is not our province just now to inquire. The object of citing this history is to show the commencement, the very slight dawn, but still a dawn, of the struggle that was now beginning between Church and State; how the spiritual power, which was a government over the souls of men, began now to be at issue with the temporal power, which was a government over their bodies. In this unhappy and most cruel case, the battle went against the spiritual power, and ended in its defeat. For some time, the successors of Martin dared not lift up their heads against the Emperors; but there was the power still remaining in its embryo form, ready to break out again when opportunity should serve.

Gregory II. was the eighty-eighth Bishop of Rome, and succeeded to the Papacy in the year 715. He finds Theodosius emperor, who very shortly resigns and leaves the empire to Leo,

surnamed the Iconoclast. Now begins the celebrated contest between the East and West about the worship of images. Leo resolves to abolish them, as offensive to true religion, and opposed to the Word of God. Accordingly, in the tenth year of his reign, he publishes his celebrated edict against their use. This is not the place to enter into the merits of that controversy, or to say how far the veneration of images may be allowed as memorials, distinctly kept asunder from all adoration of them. The line is delicate that is drawn between these two points, and the danger of transgressing that line so great that we should rather take the side of Leo, bearing the name of the Iconoclast or Image-breaker, than run the risk of incurring the idolatrous teaching of a true image-worshipper. But that is not the point at present to be considered. We have only to deal with the issue of that controversy in the conduct of Gregory II.

Upon the publication of the edict, Leo communicated what he had done to Gregory, and several letters passed between them, the one urging, the other resisting, the edict. At Ravenna, when the edict was proclaimed, the people rose in rebellion, and declared they would rather renounce their allegiance to the Emperor than abandon their images. Luitbrand, King of the Lombards, observing the disaffection of the Italian people, and desiring to advance his kingdom into the heart of Italy, took immediate

advantage of this disaffection, and suddenly appeared before Ravenna and besieged it. The garrison, induced by the profession which he carefully made of love of image-worship, surrendered the town, and Luitbrand advanced into Italy, threatening even Rome itself. But Gregory, when he perceived that by resisting the Emperor he had only brought a fresh danger upon himself in regard of the Lombards, dissimulated; and for a time, by the help of the Venetians, and resorting to many contrivances of diplomacy, staved off the danger. Meanwhile, the whole of Italy, and the islands of the Archipelago and parts of Asia, were ravaged with civil war. Leo stedfastly persisted in his determination to abolish the images, and through all opposition, both of his own Patriarch of Constantinople, and the Pope of Rome, carried his edict into execution. He set aside Germanus, Patriarch of Constantinople, who was in favour of images, and substituted Anastasius, who was on his own side; then wrote to Gregory again, once more exhorting and beseeching him to join in the abolition of what was so manifestly dangerous to true religion. Now the contest thickened. What was the reply? The reply was, that the Pope bade the Emperor "*go and learn his catechism among the children of his schools, and take care not to let his school-fellows know that he was an enemy to images, lest they should throw their horn books at his head.*" He addresses him with the contemptuous terms of "ignorant,

stupid, and dull," calls him a "conceited pretender to learning, and void of all judgment and sense." *

Leo then proposes a Council, as the only true method by which the controversy might be settled. It was certainly a matter worthy of a Council, for the greater part of the Empire was involved in civil war; but to this proposal, meaning it to be an act of defiance, Gregory wrote in reply as follows:—

"But suppose I should obey you, suppose bishops should assemble from all parts of the world, where could they find a pious and religious Emperor, to take his place among them according to custom, in order to reward those who speak well, and check such as speak amiss? As for you, you are more like a barbarian than a Christian Emperor, and actually engaged in a turbulent, wicked, and insolent undertaking. Pursue it no further; trouble the world no longer; and the assembling of a Council will be needless. But you threaten, and think to frighten us, saying, 'I will cause even the image of S. Peter in Rome to be broken in pieces, and the Pontiff Gregory to be seized, and carried in chains to Constantinople, as it happened to Pope Martin in the time of the Emperor Constans.' But your threats make no impression upon us; the Pontiff

* Baronius, Annal. 726, p. 65.

Gregory needs only retire twenty-four furlongs from Rome to be out of your reach, and bid you defiance. It is true the holy Pontiff Martin was seized, was carried in chains by tyrannical violence to Constantinople, and, after unheard of sufferings, sent from thence into exile. But Constans, by whom he was thus inhumanly treated, was murdered in the church, and died in his sins; whereas Martin is honoured all over the North as a saint, and people flock from all parts to his tomb, where miraculous cures are daily performed in their favour: I should think myself happy could I tread in his footsteps: but yet I think it advisable to consult my own safety at so critical a juncture, since the eyes of the whole of the West are upon me, and all trust in me, and in him whose image you threaten to have broken in pieces; nay, all the kingdoms in the West look upon him as a terrestrial God. Let me therefore advise you not to meddle with his image. The people in the West are all ready to revenge, and would upon such a provocation, the cruel and undeserved treatment which their friends have met with from you in the East. And now that I have warned you, I shall be innocent of the blood that will certainly be shed, if you offer to insult, as you threaten to do, the Prince of the Apostles in his image."*

And, in this style, much more was written,

* Baron. Ann. 726, p. 65—77.

and many words of arrogant defiance set forth from time to time.

But a deeper principle, involving the real foundation of the matter, ever and anon broke forth. The Emperor had said that it was incumbent upon him, as the chief ruler in the State, to reform abuses. He had authority, most surely, for saying so, from those Jewish kings, such as Hezekiah and Josiah, who, in the reformation of the Temple Services, received the praise of GOD. But in answer to that remark, the Pope tells him "that the dull and stupid understanding of a soldier was not capable of judging of dogmas and doctrines; that it was his own province as bishop to regulate the affairs of the Church." He confesses that he has not earthly armies to oppose him, but trusting in a higher power, he "*prays Christ that He will let the devil loose upon him.*"

He then proceeds from step to step in withdrawing his allegiance from the Emperor; and not only his own, but all the subjects of Italy committed to his charge as bishop. Whether he actually excommunicated the Emperor or not is a disputed point. The Greek historians inform us that he did, while the Latin writers are silent on the subject. Baronius says that:—

"He restrained the people from revolting, so long as he retained any hopes of the Emperor's revoking his impious edict. But finding that in

spite of all his endeavours, he continued obstinate and grew hardened in his wickedness, he thought it was high time to lay the axe to the root of the tree, and he gave accordingly, in virtue of his Apostolic authority, the signal for cutting it down. The signal (excommunication) roused all the faithful in the West. They renounced their allegiance to Leo, and adhered to the Pope."*

And Bellarmine says that Gregory,

"Having excommunicated Leo, ordered that no tribute should be henceforth paid to him by his subjects in Italy, and thus deprived him of that part of the Empire, nay, and if some authors are to be credited, of the whole Empire."†

Upon which Gibbon says:—

"The modern champions of Rome are eager to accept the praise and the precedent. This great and glorious example of the deposition of royal heretics is celebrated by the cardinals, Baronius and Bellarmine, and if they are asked why the same thunders were not hurled against the Neros and Julians of antiquity, they reply that the weakness of the primitive Church was the sole cause of their patient loyalty."‡

Now, what shall we say of this sad history?

---

* Baronius, Ann. 730, p. 99.

† Bellarm, "De Rom. Pont." s. 5, c. 8.

‡ Vol. ix. ch. xlix.

Whether the Emperor Leo was right in his attempt to purify the Church of an abuse is one question, and whether the worship of images be an abuse is another question; but whether Gregory was justified in the temper and manner of his intercourse and dealing with one who at any rate was his King and Sovereign, is still quite another question. When we look upon the manner in which our Blessed LORD subjected Himself to the temporal power of a king, adverse to the true GOD, and look forward from Him to Gregory dealing with Leo, who was at least a Christian and a king who had it in his heart to do a righteous act, we cannot but see a very different spirit. Is it not the spirit of that pride and unbending haughtiness which cometh of the "Prince of this world," with whom CHRIST says that He had nothing to do? *Was Gregory II. a fair representative of Christ?*

Baronius may be taken as the expressly approved annalist of the Roman Church. His writings are of the later period of the Papacy and he is the exponent of opinions which are held to this day among the ultramontane Romanists. He says that Gregory II. "*left a worthy example to posterity that heretical princes should not be suffered to reign.*" How much is involved in this dogma! It is implied—

1. That an individual bishop has a right to judge of what is, or what is not, heresy.

2. That worship of images, such as we know were then used in the Church, not for memory, but for adoration, is so necessary to salvation, that to deny it, or put it aside, is heresy.

3. That, upon this judgment of heresy so made, a private bishop may at once absolve subjects from their obedience to their lawful sovereign, deprive him of the tribute due to him by his authority as king, break down and destroy all bonds of civil law, and deprive kings of their authority to rule.

Now, in regard to the first point here involved, one would think that not improbably a Council of the Church, whose pattern is given us in the Acts of the Apostles and followed in the purest ages of the Church, would have decreed the faith with more right to authority than an individual bishop.

In regard to the second, one would have thought that God's own word, which speaks with no want of clearness in the Book of Exodus on the subject of images, would have made even a Pope think twice before he impetuously advocated their use as necessary to salvation.

In regard to the third, one would have dwelt with some little respect, to say nothing more, on the direction of our Lord, Who once spoke about "the things of Cæsar" as still remaining of authority, albeit they should be in the hands

of one opposed to "the things of God;" and one would have thought of the Apostle's injunction of giving to all their dues, even from Christians to Pagan Emperors—"Tribute to whom tribute is due, custom to whom custom, fear to whom fear, honour to whom honour."

CHAPTER XXIV.

The inroads of the vast hordes of the North which devastated Italy in the fifth and sixth centuries, and gradually broke up the ancient Roman Empire, not only introduced a barbarian ignorance among the people, but became one of the principal foundations upon which the Papal supremacy was ultimately reared. The power of the Druidical priests over the pagan nations was absolute, and their authority was next to that of their deity himself. We are told by Julius Cæsar that among the Gauls,—

"The Druids are esteemed of very great honour. In almost all controversies, both public and private, their decree is decisive; and if any crime is committed, if there is murder, if there is a dispute about an inheritance, or about a boundary, they decide the cause, appoint the damages and the punishment; and if any man, either in his public capacity or private, does not

abide by their judgment, they are interdicted from the sacrifices." *

The Christian bishops too readily received the supremacy of honour which the pagan converts were anxious to bestow; and thus by degrees arose that absolute authority over the souls of men, which the Church asserted to be inherent by Divine right. The Chief Bishop stood in the place of the Chief Druid, and the authority vested in the one was as a matter of course transferred to the other.

Combined with this peculiar reverence for the chief priests of religion, there arose another idea which was also in harmony with pagan rites, namely, that an atonement could be made for the sins of youth by payments of money or endowments of land at the end of life. A third superstition arose in the form of a redemption, by means of money, of the souls of the dead; whensoever it was supposed that such souls had been consigned to a place of suffering. The doctrine of Purgatory suggested masses for the repose of these souls, and their redemption out of a penal state of misery which it was intolerable for charity to contemplate without an attempt at least of alleviation. These masses were to be gained by payments of money. A fourth superstition arose from the practice of penances and excommunications, which, in the first instance

* Cæsar, "De Bell. Gall.," lib. vi. c. 13.

designed for the personal chastisement of sin, were afterwards commuted for donations and bequests of money or land, and it was thought that alms given to the support of a bishop, a monastery, or a church, were a substitute in the eyes of GOD for the personal punishment which justice had otherwise demanded.

From all these sources combined there arose in the eighth century a fashion throughout all ranks of society to endow the Church with the riches of the world. And this not only in reference to territorial possessions, but also in reference to titles of honour and worldly rank. Hence the bishops, abbots, and priests of every grade are no longer found as the mere possessors of the pastoral staff, but as counts, earls, and dukes, with coronets of princely honour, and with the claims of feudal barons. They issue forth no longer as the shepherd guiding the sheep along the lonely valleys of a pure and gentle faith, but out of castles, fortresses, and palaces, with the insignia of worldly grandeur, and the ambition of worldly enterprise. They are endowed with the kingdoms of the world and all that "glory of them" which their Divine LORD had, it seems, in vain denounced. They mingle in political contention, and dispute with kings for the government, not of souls, but of nations.

And if this were the case with the bishops of inferior sees, much more was it the case with

him who had assumed to himself the title of "*Universal*" Bishop. Kings took delight in endowing with vast territories of land, and with rich domains and patrimonies, that princely bishop, who was now called most ominously "*the Pontiff*," from the Latin "*Pontifex*," which was the title of the high-priest of heathen rites. A semi-barbarian education, and a partial profession of Christianity, enveloped with awful mystery this chief-priest, who seemed to hold in his hands the salvation of the soul; and it was grateful to imagine that a life of war, plunder, and sin could be atoned for, by laying down the spoils at the foot of S. Peter's successor.

These royal gifts were called "*Regalia*," and throughout the eighth and ninth centuries the endowments of the throne of the Fisherman assumed so vast a proportion that they threatened the absorption of the greater part of Europe.

Gregory III. was elected Pope in the year 732. He inherited from his predecessor the great contest with the Eastern Emperor Leo, concerning the worship of images, and that inheritance he gladly assumed. He assembled a Council in which images were deemed to be legitimate objects of worship, filled the churches with them, appointed services in their especial honour, and pauperised the whole city by expending immense sums of money in their decoration.

But in the midst of his zealous defiance of the

East, there arose at his very gates an enemy from the West.

Luitbrand, King of the Lombards, stood before the walls of Rome, and the city, impoverished and defenceless, was within his grasp. What was to be done? The Pontiff had broken with the Emperor, and although by all the laws which bound a subject to a prince, it was his duty to place himself within his jurisdiction and submit to his authority, yet now, cut off from the East by his own policy, he had neither opportunity, nor indeed any moral right, to do so. Rome had become a kind of republic. It was virtually governed by itself, under the headship of its bishop. It had taken its place in the political strife of nations, and by the laws of that political strife it must abide.

Now let the reader observe. Just at this very period, the Merovingian line of Frankish kings was beginning to decline. Charles Martel was in name Mayor of the Palace, but in reality he exercised sovereign authority. By his skill as a soldier, and his military success in many wars, he had become the most powerful leader of the West. But he was deficient in that kind of divine sanction which the Christian religion required, for any positive assumption of the crown. The Pope in his extremity had written an appeal to him on the ground of his duty to defend the Church. But to his appeal, *as a mere duty*, Charles Martel had turned a deaf ear.

Could any other argument prevail? Was there anything more persuasive than duty? Ambition. He sent a second embassy with a proposal that the city of Rome, with all its fair domains and territories, should renounce their allegiance to the Emperor of the East, and place itself under Charles Martel.

The bait succeeded. A treaty on these grounds was quickly signed. The Frankish monarchy, virtually in the hand of Charles Martel, became the Sovereign of Rome. The Empire of the East was cast adrift; and the dominion of the Roman Emperors, which began in Constantine the Great, virtually ceased.

This, however, was but the beginning, a little seed-plot of the fruits that were afterwards to come. Both Gregory and Charles departed this life shortly after this treaty, and history gives us in their respective places Zachary, as the Bishop of Rome, and Pepin, son of Charles, Mayor of the Palace, or, as we should say, Prime Minister, under Childeric, King of the Franks, in the year 741.

And now very nearly the same game is played over again. Astulphus, King of the Lombards, besieges Rome. Zachary, the Bishop, applies for help to Pepin, Mayor of the Palace. The East is out of the question, for the Emperor is occupied with wars of his own, and his power is evidently so declining that he can neither furnish

fleets nor armies. There are evidently two great powers springing up out of the ancient Western Empire—France and Lombardy. What shall Pepin do to acquire a crown? What shall Zachary do to uphold his authority as Pontiff, and save the people who are entrusted to his keeping? Perhaps we might be induced to say that as the former possessors of the See of S. Peter, not mingling in the things of Cæsar, but busied entirely with the things of God, would have cheerfully perished, had God so willed it, so it might have been with Zachary; and not heeding whether Astulphus were King, coming from the Lombards, or Pepin coming from the Franks, or, better still, whether the Emperor of the East had been permitted to maintain his rightful authority, he should have added another name to the list of those holy martyrs and confessors who had been the glory of the Church in heathen times. But such a thought was not by any means to be entertained. The Bishops of Rome were now to be immersed in the politics and wars of the nations, and it was by stratagems of the world, not by trust in the governing power of God, that the Church was to be exalted.

Clovis had founded the Frankish monarchy. The descendants of Clovis had possessed the kingly power for nearly three centuries. The people were not unwilling to obey them; and there was a feeling of subjection to rightful authority which was not easy to remove. But just

as before in Charles Martel's case, so now in Pepin's: religion must throw its sanction over the revolution which should take place. Pepin had closely watched the progress of Astulphus before the gates of Rome. Zachary had clearly understood the terms upon which Pepin would come to his aid. They mutually saw each other's interests. They mutually perceived the advantage which each might gain. The people, as yet rude and semi-barbarian, would give heed to the voice of the Chief Bishop, and his decree would seem the judgment of the Divine will. Burchard, Bishop of Wurtzburg, and Fulrad, Abbot of S. Denis', were sent to propose the following question to the Pope. "*Who best deserves to be styled king—he who is possessed of the power, or he who is only possessed of the title?* Zachary, well understanding the meaning of the question, solved it thus—"*He ought rather to be styled king that is possessed of the power, than he who is only possessed of the title.*"

In this simple question and its solution is involved that which has not unfrequently disturbed the peace of nations, and more than once hurried thousands of souls in the midst of war and the battle-field to a miserable death.

Is the solution of Pope Zachary the right one? Is the doctrine of the divine right of kings wrapped up in the decision of the Bishop of Rome? When the Bishop of Rome declares to the world what is the will of God,

as to the dynasty of the kings of the earth, is that declaration binding? In our own later days we have seen much the same solution of the question as in the eighth century, when Europe was not divided into the many kingdoms which now appear on map. Much the same question which impelled Zachary to favour Pepin, and pronounce him King of France, impelled Pope Pius VII. not only to recognise a successful general as king of the same country, but also to anoint him with the sacred oil, and place the imperial crown upon his head, in the person of Napoleon I. And even yet still further; since the Papacy never errs, it is but reasonable that we should find, as we do, a curiously close analogy in the history of the very time in which we live now. Pope Pius IX., at the very time at which we write, stands helplessly acknowledging, and yet obstinately rejecting, the power of Napoleon III. Pope Pius IX. has called that Emperor "the eldest son of the Church." Pope Pius IX. addresses that successful intriguer by the title of an earthly king, and bows down before him as his lord, simply because he has "*the power*;" while there stands one not very far off who certainly is as destitute of the power as he is the legitimate inheritor of the title. But the Papacy is true to itself; and most likely it is so, because it must be, according to the theory, infallible. The rightful King of the Frankish Empire was Childeric, descended from Clovis; but the infallibility

of the Papal power, undisturbed, may we say, by the influences of the world, unterrified by the passions of men, and perfectly unselfish as to any temporal advantages, pronounced that "*power alone gave a right to royalty.*" The rightful King of France, as far as title goes, is now the Count of Chambord; but this infallibility of the Papal power, having nothing more at heart, may we say, than justice and right, and fearing nothing from Almighty God but to dispute His Divine Will, receives the help of the powerful Napoleon, places itself under the dominion of his soldiers, and solves the question of the divine right of kings in the nineteenth century, just as Zachary did in the eighth. At least, then, there is consistency in the Pontifical authority of Rome, whatever may become of any higher notions of abstract right, truth, honour, and religion.

But we must now return to our more immediate subject. The compact between Pepin and Zachary did not immediately bear its reward, for it cost more than one passage of the Alps to subdue the predatory Lombards, and more than once did Astulphus stand as conqueror before the gates of Ravenna and of Rome. Pepin became king, and still continuing his defensive alliance with the Papacy, was engaged in constant war with the Lombards on its behalf. But Zachary soon after ceased to be Pope. He was succeeded

in the year 752 by Stephen II., the ninety-first Bishop of Rome.

The position, both of the city and of the faith, embodied in the person of its bishop, was now in imminent jeopardy, and never perhaps more needing the "wisdom of the serpent" in combination with the "harmlessness of the dove." Of the former, the new Pope soon displayed an adequate supply; of the latter, the reader will best judge in the sequel of his Pontificate. The East stood on the one side, with the Emperor still keeping aloof, though claiming as the right of his inheritance the government of the whole of Italy. The Lombards, with the fiery and impetuous Astulphus, stood on the other side, continually pressing Ravenna, the seat of the Exarchate, and holding Rome as his certain prey at any time that it might suit him to enter its gates.

Nor was the Roman population within the city any less the subject of care to its bishop than the enemies which surrounded its gates without. For centuries the Romans had been the creatures of a blind submission to the despotism of Emperors who knew nothing but the power of the sword to coerce and to subdue. They had altogether fallen from that heroism and independence of character which had marked their earlier history. They were now but a fallen and degraded people, of a mixed race, half barbarian, half slaves, despised by their conquerors, and held in

contempt by the warlike tribes who on every side surrounded them. In the name of a "Roman," says Luitbrand, "we include whatever is base, whatever is cowardly, whatever is perfidious, the extremes of avarice and luxury, and every vice that can prostitute the dignity of human nature."* And thus they stood, helplessly as it seemed, and the mere prey of him who should become the strongest by the accidents of war. There was but a choice between the Emperor of the East, still their legitimate Sovereign, and Pepin, the rising power of the West. And the only question was, to which should Stephen incline? His predecessors had led the way in a similar choice. Could he do better than follow it? A vigorous and warlike king was to be preferred to an evidently decaying empire surrounded by foes which were daily gathering strength for its utter subjugation. Stephen must follow in the steps of Zachary. It must be either ruin or the submission of the city to Pepin. But there might be *a bargain*. The Pope, as the chief representative of religion, had spiritual things to offer; might not Pepin confer temporal advantages in return?

It was the custom of the people of God in the Jewish dispensation to confer a sanctity upon royalty by anointing with oil. The crown was set upon the head of kings by the high-priest.

* See Gibbon's "Decline and Fall," ch. xlix.

Might not a Pope follow in the track of so good a precedent, and in conferring a spiritual blessing reap a reward in a temporal defence against temporal enemies? The answer to such questions was immediate and decisive. From Pavia, flying from the Lombards, Stephen very soon arrived at the court of Pepin. Accompanied by a long retinue of bishops and ecclesiastics, he took up his abode at the monastery of S. Maurice, on the banks of the Rhone. Thither the royal candidate for a religious sanction for usurpation quickly followed. Pepin, accompanied by his wife and children, prostrated himself in due submission before the feet of the Pope. The observances of the court being duly performed, then followed the ceremonies of religion, and the eyes of the vulgar were quickly rivetted on the sacredness of Christian anointing. The King had before been subjected to this ceremony by Boniface; but a Papal addition to the blessing of an ordinary bishop was too valuable a treasure to lose. And thus the bargain was sealed; the Frankish king forthwith entered Lombardy; two several times he defeated and repulsed Astulphus, and two several times he stood before the threshold of the Apostle, with his successor at his right hand, saved from the destruction of the Lombards. Nor was this all; nay, it was but a very small part of the obligations which the spiritual power then first incurred at the hands of the temporal. Whether there was a bond of

treaty so sacred in the hands of a victorious general that religion compelled its fulfilment, or whether in the retrospect of a past life of wrong and spoliation, Pepin had embraced the idea that donations of lands and wealth to the representative of the Church would make up for the sins of a past life; so it was that on the occasion of his last entry into Lombardy, and on the final subjugation of Astulphus, there did then take place a solemn delivery of the territories of the conquered enemy into the hands of Stephen. Northern Italy; the dominions of Ravenna, Bolonga, and Ferrara; the Pentapolis stretching along the Adriatic from Rimini to Ancona; in short, all that beautiful and important tract of country, great part of which still forms what are called "The Papal States," were at that time by Pepin, who may be denominated the Founder of the French monarchy, solemnly handed over to the custody of the Pope; and over them all, from that time, the Pope held temporal jurisdiction. In this transaction says Gibbon,—

"The ambition and avarice of the Popes has been severely condemned. Perhaps the humility of a Christian priest should have rejected an earthly kingdom, which it was not easy for him to govern without renouncing the virtues of his profession. Perhaps a faithful subject, or even a generous enemy, would have been less impatient to divide the spoils of the barbarian, and if

the Emperor had instructed Stephen to solicit in his name the restitution of the Exarchate, I will not absolve the Pope from the reproach of treachery and falsehood. But in the right interpretation of the laws, every one may accept whatever his benefactor can bestow, without injustice." *

Thus then it was. All historians agree that under the impression then customary among the earlier converts of the Northern nations, that lands and wealth poured into the bosom of the Church would tend to save the soul, Pepin, the Frankish king, did make this extraordinary grant to Stephen, the Bishop of Rome; and that Stephen did then, in his own name and in behalf of his successors, receive this accession of temporal dignity. He had gone from Pavia at the commencement of his Pontificate a suppliant for relief from immediate destruction; he returned at the close of it, endowed with the territorial possessions of a temporal prince. Whether one who is a subject can enter into a treaty with another who is victorious in war, and by conferring on that other privileges supposed to be spiritual, in return receive endowments of temporal aggrandisement out of the possessions of a third, to whom alone the right of those endowments belongs, is a question which may be left

* Gibbon, ch. xlix.

for casuists to determine. To whom belonged the right of the Sovereignty of those Italian States of which Pepin took possession at the instigation of Stephen? Had Pepin the right of them by conquest? How did Pepin himself achieve the right of invading Italy as a king? Was it by usurpation, or by legitimate succession? If not by legitimate succession, to whom did he owe the claim of title which he had set up? Did anointing, received from a bishop, justify the dethronement of one king and the setting up of another? And then when that other was set up, did it justify the acceptance from that other by that bishop of royal domains and princely territories in the name of religion? These are questions which again may be safely left to casuists to determine.

But when all this is passed over and explained, when the right of the sword is acknowledged, and the power of the stronger is conceded to be the rule by which kings reign; we have still to come to the graver question of the assumption of a temporal sovereignty by the spiritual pastor of the Church of Jesus Christ. It must have been a wonderful scene for the holy angels to behold, and the many saints who had been brought before kings in a somewhat different manner in the days of ancient Rome; it must have been a wonderful scene for those holy bishops whose blood had enriched the shrines of the catacombs in their many martyrdoms, if

haply they could look down from heaven now and see what was passing on the earth; yes, it must have been very strange for Peter, the Apostle of the Circumcision, and Clement, and Victor, and Urbanus, and all these holy ones of old, to see what now took place. What would they see? They would see a warrior, a half barbarian king, gathering together tributes of the earth in all their glory, and laying them at the feet of him who was commissioned to forswear them. They would see one king destroying another, solemn treaties signed, deeds of lands and kingdoms, cities and territories, with their keys and all their municipal rights and privileges, laid solemnly on the tomb of that Apostle who was commissioned by JESUS "to provide neither gold, nor silver, nor brass in his purse, nor scrip for his journey, neither two coats, neither shoes, nor yet staves." They would see one who had been ordained of GOD to render the things of Cæsar to Cæsar, as though they were of necessity things separate from the things of GOD, now commingling the two, and in his own person assuming the rights of both. They would see one who was a disciple of a Master which had said, "Who made Me a ruler and divider over you," as though any intermixture with the judgments of the world were a thing abhorrent to His teaching; now assuming the seat of temporal jurisdiction and taking his place among the rulers of the nations. They would see one who

should have learned, if he had learned anything, that the kingdom of his Master was "not of this world," now taking his place in that very world as a prince and potentate, seeking it, trusting to it, building up his strength upon it, and rejoicing in the glories of it, as though it had been an inheritance suitably descending from Him, "Who had not where to lay His head."

CHAPTER XXV.

Hildebrand, in the year 1073, was Archdeacon of Rome; a position of high authority, and one which had long given him the virtual administration of the affairs of the whole Church. Never had there been a time when the circumstances of the world so urgently demanded the judgment of wise rulers, and Alexander II., then being principally guided by the counsels of Hildebrand, had seemed to rule the Church with as wise a policy as the difficulties of the age would permit. But that year Alexander departed this life. On the day following his death, while Hildebrand was necessarily engaged in the performance of the funeral rites, and the clergy stood around the bier of the deceased pontiff, suddenly a cry was heard from the populace; "Hildebrand shall be Pope." "S. Peter has chosen him." Their cries, running through the church, were taken as

the voice of God; and the cardinals, compelled by the occasion, with one voice elected Hildebrand as the successor of Alexander. Whether this was in good faith the pure movement of the people in consequence of Hildebrand's well-known talents, so successfully exerted in the preceding reign; or whether it was an artifice by which the event so long desired by himself was successfully achieved, historians cannot determine; but by this outbreak of popular feeling the election was certainly achieved, and Hildebrand ascended the Papal chair as the hundred and fifty-fifth Bishop of Rome, assuming the name of Gregory VII.

There had been three hundred years of gross abuse of the highest privileges of Christianity since the time that Stephen II. first received the regalia from Pepin, King of France. Charlemagne, his successor, had ruled the West in undisputed dominion; but his successors had declined and failed; and now the Empire of the Carlovingian dynasty had been severed into many portions. But Henry IV., King of Germany, stood foremost as represenative of the preceding empire; foremost not only in authority, but in the general iniquities of a licentious age. Kings and Popes were but vying with each other in a contest for worldly power. They had made this infamous compact in Stephen II., and they had only fulfilled the necessary result of that compact in fresh alliances of sin, and in gradual loss of all holiness of

faith. The one polluted the anointing graces of the Spirit of God in crowning and sanctioning the power of unjust and tyrannical kings; the other for the purchase of these outward sanctions of religion encumbered the Papacy with personal treasures, endowments of land, and all the usual accessories of temporal sovereignty. Thus it was that in the year 800, Leo III. crowned Charlemagne Emperor of the West. Valentine, in the year 837, became as Pope an enthroned king, feudal indeed, and tributary to the Empire, but exercising complete princely power as such. Nicholas I., in the year 858, in the same manner assumed a royal crown, and John X., in the year 913, losing sight entirely of the pastoral staff, is found at the head of his army with sword and buckler, as a general defending his kingdom against the Saracens. So, too, Leo IX., in the year 1053, not as in the preceding instance against infidels, but against his own spiritual children the Normans, engages without the slightest scruple in personal battle, and falls into the hands of the enemy, defeated and a prisoner. In short, all the usual worldly accompaniments of the Crown and of the State became as a matter of course the leading inducements both of the election and of the policy of the Popes of Rome. The bishop was lost in the king.

The consequences of this miserable degradation of the spiritual purity of the Church were of course too plain. The disease which affected

the head could not but descend to the members. The rights of the episcopal office, of the monasteries, and chiefly of the Papacy itself, brought ever forward the most covetous, as well as the most ambitious, to seek the prizes which are contained in them. The nobles of nearly every country pressed the ordination of their younger sons and relatives, actuated by the sole desire of enriching their families. Abbacies, bishoprics, the most important spiritual charges of every kind, were conferred upon persons utterly unfitted for them, and who indeed never for a moment intended to perform any of their functions. Services of a political, a personal, and sometimes even of a menial character, were rewarded by offices in the Church. Dependants who were intended still to remain in the households of the nobility were paid for their services by being forced into holy orders, and then endowed with spiritual benefices.

Thus writes one of those few bishops of the age who dared to lift up his voice against so degrading a custom :—

" Such is the disgrace of our times that there is scarcely one to be found who aspires to any degree of honour or temporal distinction who has not his domestic priests, and this not that he may obey them, but that he may command their obedience alike in things lawful and unlawful, in things human, and things divine, so that these

chaplains are constantly to be found serving the tables, mixing the strained wine, leading out the dogs, managing the ladies' horses, or looking after the lands."*

And this advanced still further, until nearly every office in the Church became more or less the object of public sale. Gold was freely tendered to the holders of ecclesiastical benefices for their open purchase, and bishops, monks, the magnates of the empire, and even the king himself, were participators in the nefarious traffic. It was the common stain and pollution of the whole land. The wanton contempt of all decency in the avowed simony of the Church became a scandal, which, all bearing a share in it, there seemed no one bold enough to denounce.

Another degradation of the Church, which had in a parallel manner grown out of this unholy junction between the Church and the State, was the custom of investiture. As on the one hand benefices were to be obtained, and offices of trust or power to be exercised by one party, and these benefices or offices were the creation or the gift of the other party, so a custom had grown up of investing the persons endowed with such offices with certain symbols or signs of power. Now, from Charlemagne's time it had been the custom to preserve this investing power in the hands of

* Agobard, Archbishop of Lyons.

the State, and every bishop on entering his office was to be invested by the temporal power with the sarcedotal ring and the pastoral staff. In the pastoral staff, or rod, there was signified the emblem of authority, such as was conveyed to the hands of Moses in the smiting of the rock; and in the ring was involved the idea of the seal of the Spirit, by which the priest or bishop was espoused to the church, benefice, or see over which he was set. The point of objection was not to the symbols of authority themselves, but to the hands from which they were received. The Church, though receiving without regret the temporal benefits of land and other endowments, could not brook the acknowledgments that her spiritual offices descended from any other source than her own inherent authority. But she had accepted the gifts, and her coffers had been enriched on this condition. She had sold her spiritual office. She must not now complain of paying the price. And yet this was the great source of her degradation. The spirit of purity was lost. The world was considered her benefactor by reason of the gifts which were bestowed; and the hearts of the covetous sought those gifts, not in any love for the office which was imparted but by reason of the enjoyment of the worldly benefactions. And these benefactions, bought and sold in the great market of simony, were received with a token of bowing the head, and

worshipping the god Mammon, from whom they proceeded. Could degradation be greater?

Such was the position of the Church, and such the character of the world around her, when Gregory VII. was called to the throne of the Papacy. From his experience as archdeacon in the former reigns, he knew the evils that surrounded him. From his knowledge of Henry IV., then King of Germany, he knew the contests into which he should be plunged. The battle was to be fought between the Church and the world. The question is, did Hildebrand enter into the contest with the single motive of exalting the spiritual character of the Church and of purifying her, as the Body of CHRIST, from the pollutions with which she was stained; or was he actuated by the very same principles as those of the kings of the earth with whom he contended. Was he a sincere Reformer desiring to abolish abuses which he acknowledged, or was he but one more in the list of those Popes, who imagined that to exalt the temporal supremacy of the Papal see above the kings of the earth, was the only true glory of the Christian faith.

The reader must judge.

Nearly the first important act of his Papacy was to throw down the gauntlet of defiance to the kings and princes of the whole West. Henry IV. was the sovereign who, according to the principles of those times, was his feudal lord, and against that prince no doubt it was that the

blow was mainly directed; but it affected in its delivery the whole of Christendom. The point of advance was very important. Hitherto the question had been, shall the Bishops of Rome be kings in an equal line with other kings; now it became the question, shall the Bishops of Rome be kings over all others. The advance was to be made, not only of equal but of superior right, identifying in it the question which is understood in the term PAPAL SUPREMACY.

A Council was held at Rome in the year 1074, and the following decree was made. It was levelled as a direct assault against lay investiture:—

"If any one shall henceforth accept of a bishopric or abbey from a layman, let him not be looked upon as a bishop or abbot, and let not any respect be paid to him as such. We moreover exclude him from the grace of S. Peter, and forbid him to enter the Church till he has resigned the dignity that he has got by ambition, and by disobedience, which is idolatry. And this decree extends to inferior dignities. For in like manner, if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or any other secular person whatever, shall take upon him to give the investiture of a bishopric, or of any other ecclesiastical dignity, he shall be liable to the same sentence."*

* Labbe et Cossart, Concil. tom. vi. pt. i. p. 1550.

What was the result? Henry, highly indignant at this encroachment on his prerogative inherited from Charlemagne, names forthwith his bishops to the vacant sees just as before, and proceeds with their investiture. He even goes out of his way to do so, with wanton exaggeration and open simony. Then Gregory writes to the King in these words:—

"Gregory, Bishop, servant of the servants of God, to King Henry health and the apostolic blessing, if indeed he be obedient, *as it befits a Christian King, to the Apostolic See.*"

"Considering and anxiously pondering on the strictness of that Judge to whom we must give an account of our stewardship; of that ministry committed to us through the blessed Peter, prince of Apostles; we have thus doubtingly transmitted to thee the Apostolic blessing. For thou art reported knowingly to hold communion with those who have been excommunicated by the judgment of the Apostolic See, and by a synodal censure. And if this be so, then thyself knowest that thou canst receive the benefit neither of the Divine nor of the Apostolic benediction, until, separating persons thus sentenced from thee, and compelling them to penance, thou shalt have sought, by meet repentance and amendment, absolution and remission. We counsel, therefore, thine excellence, if, in this matter thou feel thyself culpable, that thou

shouldest, with a prompt confession, seek the advice of some religious bishop, who may, by our licence, impose some penance on thee, suitable to thy fault. . . . . It would have befitted thy dignity, while thou confessest thyself a son of the Church, more reverently to regard the Church's master; that is, the blessed Peter, prince of Apostles, to whom if thou art of the LORD's flock, thou art given in charge by Him, who said unto Peter, 'Feed My sheep;' and again, 'And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven.' . . . . To the Apostles, and to their successors, the LORD deigned to say, 'He that heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you, despiseth Me.' He, therefore, that is ready to pay faithful obedience to GOD is careful, while we speak in accordance with the canons of those who have gone before us, to attend to our admonitions, as though he received them from the mouth of the Apostle himself. . . . . And we enact nothing new, nothing of our own invention, but have thought it necessary, abandoning all error, to seek out and to follow the original and only true rule of ecclesiastical discipline, the way trodden by the saints. For we know no other entrance to salvation and to life eternal than that which was shown by Him, who said, 'I am the door: by Me, if any

man enter in, he shall be saved, and shall find pasture.' "

To all this, as mere idle words, the ruthless Henry paid not the slightest attention ; but pursuing his determination to defy the Pope, he summons a Council at Worms. Then, amidst a number of bishops of his own side, he deposes Gregory from the Papal chair, and Roland, one of the priests, bears a copy of this decree to Rome. Addressing Gregory in the midst of a public assembly, he delivers his message—

" The King, and the united bishops, as well of Germany as of Italy, transmit thee this command—'Descend without delay from the throne of S. Peter, and abandon the usurped government of the Roman Church ; for to such honours should none aspire, unsanctioned by the general choice, and by the approval of the Emperor.' Then turning to the assembly, ' To you, brethren, it is commanded, that ye do at the feast of Pentecost present yourselves before the King my master, to receive a Pope and Father from his hands. This pretended pastor is but a ravening wolf.' "

In the midst of the astonishment created by these words, John, Bishop of Porto, cried out, " Seize him ! " Swords were drawn, and the poor priest would soon have paid the penalty of his boldness by his life, only that Gregory him-

self interposed. Then a letter from Henry to the Pope was delivered. It ran thus :—

"Henry, not by usurpation, but by the holy ordinance of God, King, to Hildebrand, no longer the Pope, but the false monk.

"A greeting like this hast thou for thy confusion deserved; thou, who hast left no order of the Church untouched, but hast brought upon each confusion, not honour—cursing, not blessing. To speak but of a few of thy most distinguished deeds;—the rulers of the holy Church, the archbishops, bishops, and presbyters, thou hast not only not feared, seeing that they are the Lord's anointed, to touch; but, as though they were servants who know not what their Lord doeth, thou hast trampled them under thy feet. Thou hast obtained favour with the vulgar by their humiliation; and hast thought that they knew nothing, and that thou alone knewest all things. Yet this knowledge of thine thou hast used for the purpose, not of edification, but of destruction; insomuch that we believe the blessed Gregory, whose name thou hast assumed, to have spoken prophetically of thee, when he said, 'By the abundance of subjects, the mind of him who is set over them is puffed up; for he supposes that he excels all in knowledge when he finds that he excels all in power.'

"And we indeed have borne with these things, as anxious to maintain the honour of the Apos-

tolic chair. But thou hast mistaken our humility for fear; hast dared to exalt thyself against the royal power which God has given us—yea, hast threatened to take it from us, as though the kingdom, the empire, were in thy hand, not in God's; whereas, in truth, our Lord Jesus Christ, who called us to the throne, never called thee to the priesthood. The steps by which thou hast ascended to it were cunning and fraud, abhorrent to the monastic profession. By money thou hast obtained favour; by favour the sword; by the sword the seat of peace, and from the seat of peace thou hast disturbed peace; arming subjects against their rulers, and teaching them to despise bishops who were chosen of God to their high office; whereas thou thyself wast never called to the same. And the authority of these prelates over the clergy hast thou made over to laymen; whom thou hast empowered to depose and to contemn those who had been appointed their instructors by the hand of the Lord, through the imposition of the hands of bishops. Me also, who, unworthy as I may be among the anointed, have been consecrated to the kingdom, hast thou assailed; though the tradition of the holy Fathers declares that God only is my judge, and that I can be deposed for no other crime than a defection from the faith; and though even Julian the Apostate was left by the prudence of the holy Fathers to be judged and deposed by God alone. That true Pope, S. Peter himself, saith, 'Fear

God; honour the King.' And it is because thou fearest not God, that thou dost not honour me, His deputy. But S. Paul, when condemning the angel from heaven who should preach a new doctrine, excepted not thee, who preachest novelties on earth; and he saith, 'Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed.' Do thou, therefore, lying under this curse, and condemned by the sentence of all our bishops, and by our own, come down, leave the usurped Apostolic throne, and let another ascend into the chair of S. Peter, who shall teach no violence of war, but the sound doctrine of that holy apostle. I Henry, by the grace of God, king, together with all our bishops, say unto thee, 'Come down; come down.'"*

Gregory had enough to do to lull the storm that ensued upon the reading of this and of other letters of similar import. The anger of the assembly was very fierce, and they called upon the Pope at once to proceed to excommunication. "Pronounce," they cried, "the doom by which he may be crushed. Draw forth the sword. Let him wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly." Not immediately, but the next day, the assembly having met again; in the first place, all those bishops who had sided with Henry were

* Lambert Schafn. ad. ann. 1076.

declared to be suspended from their offices, and separated from communion. Then came the sentence against the King, which the Pontiff delivered standing and looking up to heaven, in the midst of the vast assembly :—

"Blessed Peter, prince of the Apostles, incline, we beseech thee, to us thine ear, and hear me, thy servant, whom from infancy thou hast nourished, and whom, to this day, thou hast preserved from the hands of the evil ones, who have hated, and still hate me, for my fidelity to thee. Thou art my witness, with our Lady, the Mother of God, with thy brother the blessed Paul, and with all saints, that thy holy Roman Church called me, against my own will, to its governance; that I have not thought it robbery to ascend thy seat; and that I would rather have finished my life in wandering, than have seized that seat, in a worldly spirit, for the glory of this earth. Through thy favour, and not through ought that I have done, I believe it to have pleased, and still to please thee, that the Christian people, specially committed to thee, should obey me in thy stead; through thy favour I have received from God the power of binding and of loosing in Heaven and in earth. Relying on this for the honour and defence of the Church, in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and by thy power and authority, I forbid to King Henry, son of Henry the Emperor,

who, through an unexampled pride, has rebelled against thy holy Church, the government of the whole realm of Germany and Italy. I absolve all Christians from the oaths which they have taken, or may take to him; and I decree that no one shall obey him as king; for it is fitting that he, who has endeavoured to diminish the honour of the Church, should himself lose that honour which he seems to have. And because he has scorned the obedience of a Christian, refusing to return unto the LORD whom he had driven from him by his communion with the excommunicate, by spurning, as thou knowest, the admonitions given by me for his own safety's sake, and by severing himself from thy Church in the attempt to divide it, I in thy stead, bind him with the bond of anathema; thus acting in confidence on thee, that the nations may know and acknowledge that thou art Peter, that upon thy rock the Son of the living GOD hath built His Church, and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." *

What a voice was this! Such a thing had never occurred in the history of the world before. Here was one of the most powerful kings of Christendom defied by a bishop in his own kingdom; himself said to be dethroned, and another invited to take his place; while opposed to him stood that king defying his spiritual thunders,

* Labbe et Cossart, Concil. tom. vi. p. i. p. 1566.

and, in turn, deposing that Pope from his episcopal chair. It was a grand contest. Had it but been *solely* the contest of CHRIST against Belial, it had been well. But was it so? Now behold the issue. Slowly, but surely, the power of Gregory was proved to be the greater. One by one the prelates who, at first, had taken side with the King, were found seeking reconciliation with the Pope, and the people were found silently looking on with mysterious dread and secret disapproval. Gregory's idea of his prerogative is embodied in these remarkable words:—

"If the Apostolic See, by divinely constituted power, may judge spiritual things, shall it not also judge the things of earth? . . . . . If men of spiritual rank are subject to its sentence, shall not men of earthly dignity give account before it of their deeds? Do they suppose that the royal dignity exceeds the episcopal? Let them look to the origin of the two, to see how widely they differ from each other. Human pride grasped at the one, the divine commiseration bestowed the other. The one incessantly reaches after empty glory, the other aspires toward everlasting life. Let them learn what the blessed Pope Gelasius wrote to the Emperor Anastasius touching these dignities, and what S. Ambrose, in his pastoral epistle, has declared concerning them. To compare, he says, the dignity of a bishop to that of a king, is to compare things, of which the one more

exceeds the other, than the splendour of gold exceeds that of lead. And Constantine, the great Emperor, knowing these things, took his place, not first, but last, among the bishops in synod assembled. For he remembered that God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

If, indeed, Constantine could have beheld this strange issue of his first embracing of the Church, he might have been in some slight degree surprised. He might have hesitated perhaps in his idea of the meekness of the cross, if it had been presented to him with the interpretation of Gregory. But seven centuries had worked a change. It was no longer the bishop who looked for protection in the king, but the king who was to tremble before the bishop, and crouch down before him as lord of the earth.

Look along that frozen path across the Alps in the year 1076, and you will see, towards Christmas, a mean and insignificant party, consisting of a king, his wife, and infant child, without any escort or mark of royalty, struggling over deep precipitous mountain-passes in a most inclement winter. He is deserted by all those princely and noble vassals who used to throng upon his steps. They now look upon him either with hatred or contempt. Struggling forward over deep masses of ice he passes the Alpine heights, and descends into the plains of Lombardy. The German

princes had said, that unless he gained his absolution, they would desert his throne, and transfer their allegiance to another. Trembling at this, fairly beaten, dispirited, cast down, on and on the royal fugitive proceeds to seek his adversary, the meek and gentle bishop. But that bishop, to make his victory the more signal, had gone from Rome to Canossa in the Appennines. Towards Canossa then, a wild mountain fortress, belonging to the Countess Matilda, the king proceeds. Hundreds more of excommunicated prelates and nobles were likewise making their way to the same place, and there this mighty warrior of the Church was waiting in his triumph to receive them.

"From those," said Gregory, "who rightly acknowledge and bewail their sin, forgiveness cannot be withheld, but the petitioners must submit to the cauterising process which is needful for the healing of their wounds; that they may not, by too lightly obtaining absolution, be led too lightly to regard the sin they have committed, of disobedience to Apostolical authority."

And now the principal offender approached. That which Gregory had proclaimed to be the principle of his government as head of the Church he now demonstrated in action. Here was a king crouching before his feet. He was determined to let the whole world be witness of his power. "If, indeed," he said, "the king repents

of his past conduct, let him surrender in token of his sincere repentance, his crown, his sceptre, and the other ensigns of his royalty into the custody of the Apostolic See, and thus acknowledge that after the course he has pursued he is unworthy to bear the name of king." These conditions were however afterwards relaxed, and it was sufficient that the king should approach in the garb of a penitent. And this he agreed to do. He came alone to the outer gate of the castle, a miserable spectacle, exposed to cold and hunger the whole day, but his admission was refused; the next day again; the third day again, in vain expecting each hour that Gregory would at length admit him to his presence. It moved all men but Gregory himself; indeed some ventured to say in his presence, that his conduct was more like wanton tyranny than that of the severity of an Apostle. At length, in the fourth day of his penance, the king was admitted. There stood the powerful and youthful King of the Germans before the puny, insignificant form of Gregory, the Bishop of bishops. The sword stood quailing before the crosier. The physical power bowed before the power of the spirit. Then Gregory proceeded to an action more awful than any which had yet preceded this most awful history. He celebrated the Eucharist in the king's presence. He took the sacred Bread into his hand, and fixing his eyes upon the king, thus addressed him:—

"I have been accused by thee and thine of having by simoniacal practice obtained the Apostolic chair, as well as of having, both before and since my accession to it, stained myself by crimes which would, according to the canons, disqualify me for the ministration of any sacred office whatever. I might justify myself by proof, I might appeal to the testimony of those witnesses who have known me from my childhood, and by whose suffrages I have been elevated to the chair which I fill. But I turn from human testimony to that which is divine. Behold the Body of the LORD! Be It, this day, the witness of my innocence! May Almighty GOD free me this day, if I be innocent, from the suspicion of guilt! May He smite me, if I be guilty, by a sudden death this day! Do thou, my son, if it shall please thee, now follow my example. The princes of thine empire have accused thee before me; and have alleged thy crimes to have been such as, in justice, to require thine exclusion, not only from the seat of empire, but also from the communion of the Church, and from all intercourse with the faithful, even unto thy dying hour. They eagerly demand that a day should be appointed, and an opportunity afforded, for a legal investigation of the charges which they bring against thee. But thou knowest full well how liable are all human judgments to error; how often, in public discussions, falsehood is received for truth, being dressed out in the trap-

pings of eloquence, and thus captivating the attention, while truth, not thus artificially supported, is despised. As, therefore, I wish, now that thou hast implored the protection of the Apostolic See, that thou shouldest adopt the wisest course, I implore thee to do what I advise. If thou art conscious of thine innocence, and assured that the charges brought against thee by thine opponents are false and calumnious, free at once the Church of God from scandal, and thyself from suspicion; and take, as an appeal to Heaven, this Body of the Lord. Thus may every mouth be stopped of them that speak against thee; thus shall I become the firm advocate of thy cause, the strenuous asserter of thine innocence; thus may thy nobles be reconciled to thee, thy kingdom be restored, and the wild storms of civil war by which it is now agitated be laid to rest for ever." *

But the king rejected the pledge, and silently departed, the Pope at length pronouncing over him his final absolution.

Such was the idea of the "Papal Supremacy," and such the actions by which it was maintained towards the close of the eleventh century. If the celebrated prophecies of Isaiah, which relate to the glory of the Church, be taken literally, then did Hildebrand fulfil them, and literally did he see in his own life what the prophet had fore-

* Lamb, Schafnab. See Bowden's "Life of Gregory."

told,—"Kings shall be thy nursing-fathers, and their queens thy nursing mothers. *They shall bow down to thee with their faces towards the earth, and lick up the dust of thy feet*, and thou shalt know that I am the LORD. The sons of them that afflicted thee *shall come bending unto thee*, and all they that despised thee *shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet*, and they shall call thee the city of the LORD, the Zion of the Holy One of Israel." (Isaiah xlix. and lx.) But the question is whether in the triumphs of Hildebrand and the discomfiture of Henry, there really was any question of the Church at all; whether the whole miserable scene was not the contest of two great worldly powers, vigorously contending for supremacy for the mere world's sake. If the glory of the Church was really attained by such a fulfilment of the prophecy, it would certainly be difficult to make it tally with another which equally describes the Kingdom of CHRIST as one wherein "the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid, and the calf and the young lion and the fatling together, and a little child shall lead them." (Isaiah xi. 6.) Were not these divine truths far more nearly akin to the character of Him whose Representative Gregory assumed to be, and whose Gospel it would be hard to imagine that Gregory had not studied; than this triumph of a bishop over the kings of the earth? S. Paul had said, "Let every soul be subject to the higher powers."

(Rom. xiii. i.) And he had also said, "Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers, and to obey magistrates," (Titus iii. 1.) And he, whose chair the Pope professed to hold and whose prerogatives he was assuming, had also said, "Submit to every ordinance of man for the LORD'S sake." (1 Peter ii. 13.) That the deposition of Henry from his throne, the absolving of his subjects from their allegiance, the stirring up of civil war in his kingdom, the proud arrogance with which he, as the follower of the meek and lowly JESUS, laid his foot upon the neck of the prostrate king, and thus incorporated into himself the possessions of the world, fulfilled those Apostolic precepts, it would be perplexing for us consistently with truth to affirm.

"Romanism" is completed in the next volume.

SWIFT AND CO., REGENT PRESS, 55, KING STREET,
REGENT STREET, W.

WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED

By J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.

Dedicated, by permission, to the Lord Bishop of Exeter.

The New and Second Edition, 6s.; by Post, 6s. 4d.,
In Calf, 10s. 6d. (for Presents); by Post, 11s.

The Primitive Liturgies,

(in Greek,)

OF S. MARK, S. CLEMENT, S. JAMES, S. CHRYSOSTOM, AND S. BASIL.

Edited by the late Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D.

With New Preface by the Rev. Dr. LITTLEDALE.

"A new and most handsomely printed edition of Dr. Neale's Primitive Liturgies has just been issued. ..... The study of these, next in importance to the Holy Scriptures, will do more to extend the Catholic revival and root Evangelical truths in the minds of those who do so than aught besides. The volume, which is remarkably cheap, should be found on the library shelves of every parish priest and every well-informed layman of our beloved and Apostolical Church."—*Church News.*

"The present Edition of the Primitive Greek Liturgies is practically a reimpression of the former one. A few errors of type and of accentuation have been corrected, and, in some instances, a reading of the text which appeared to be preferable has been substituted for that previously adopted. The great impetus which has been given to Liturgical studies by causes which lie deeper than the mere passing controversies of the day is a sufficient warrant for bringing these priceless reliques of early Christian times once more before the public; and even in reference to those controversies it is impossible to overrate the clearness or importance of this testimony to the cardinal dogmas of the Real Objective Presence and the Propitiatory Sacrifice of the Eucharist for the living and the dead."—*Preface, (by Dr. Littledale).*

"With these documents of the early Church brought so cheaply to their hands, there is no excuse for our rising race of clergy—or their seniors for the matter of that—being in the same state of general ignorance of Liturgical subjects as even well-read men were thirty years ago, when Professor J. J. Blunt and Mr. Maskell began their great impetus to Liturgical study."—*Literary Churchman.*

"An admirably printed book, with the further recommendation of good paper. It is not long since that a guinea was the price of a work which is indispensable to the clergy and all who take interest in the subject of intercommunion with the Churches of the East."—*John Bull.*

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.

Price 7s.; by Post, 7s. 5d.

SANCTA CLARA ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES.

Paraphrastica Expositio Articulorum Confessionis Anglicanæ;

The Articles of the Anglican Church paraphrastically considered and explained. By FRANCISCUS A. SANCTA CLARA (Christopher Davenport). Reprinted from the Edition in Latin of 1646, with a Translation, together with Expositions and Comments in English from the Theological Problems and Propositions of the same writer, and with additional Notes and References. Edited by the Rev. FREDERICK GEORGE LEE, D.C.L.

"Nothing can be fairer in theological controversy than SANCTA CLARA; his Commentary on the 'Articles,' from a Roman Catholic point of view, being especially interesting. It is believed that this remarkable Treatise formed the basis of Mr. NEWMAN'S Tract No. 90."—*British Magazine.*

"Our dear friend's [Dr. Newman's] Tract [No. 90] has done good and lasting service by breaking off a mass of unauthorised traditional glosses which had encrusted over the Thirty-nine Articles. The interpretation which he then put forth, and which in him was blamed, was at the time vindicated by others without blame. The blame was occasioned by two circumstances, owing to which Tract 90 was thought to admit much more than our friend meant. . . . But the *principle* of Tract 90—viz., that we are not to bring into the Articles, out of any popular system, any meanings which are not contained in their words, rightly and accurately understood, was not and could not be condemned."—*Eirenicon,* by Dr. Pusey, 1865.

"It is impossible to over-estimate the enlarged views that must follow upon the careful and thoughtful study of this noble work of Sancta Clara. It will carry a stronger conviction with it than *Tract* 90, because it is more naturally put together; because it appeals more unreservedly to the teaching of the *Universal* Church; and because its spirit and temper is so gentle, mild, and loving."—*Church Review.*

"Mr. F. G. Lee, well known for his connexion with the present well-meant efforts towards the Re-union of Christendom, has republished 'Sancta Clara on the Articles,' and it is a serviceable publication. Even on purely bibliographical considerations it has a high value; but bearing in mind the converging opinions of so many minds on the temporary and occasional character of our Articles, and the certainty that the subject is acquiring daily prominence, as witness, on various sides, Dr. Pusey's 'Eirenicon,' Dean Milman's 'Speech,' and Mr. Ffoulkes' 'Divisions of Christendom;' we must say that such a contribution to the subject as Sancta Clara's work is very important."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.

Just Published, price 4s.; by Post, 4s. 3d.

The Liturgical "Reason Why:"

Being a Series of Papers on the Principles of the Book of Common Prayer. By ALFRED WILLIAMS, M.A., Rector of Culmington, Salop; Author of "HOME SERMONS," &c.

"Is by far the best little manual on the Book of Common Prayer that we have met with. It condenses all the matter of Wheatley, Palmer, Blunt, Procter, and other of our best liturgical authorities, with additional explanatory comment, into a compendious and popular form. Small and proportionately cheap as the volume is, it comprises a remarkably full and accurate glossary of theological and ecclesiastical terms."—*Ecclesiastic.*

"We are much pleased with this book. We rejoice to see the Bishop of Oxford's protest against the profane and shocking novelty of Evening Communions given."—*Church Review.*

"This is on the whole a good and useful book. Those who want a reverent and sensible statement of what are called High-Church views, expressed in plain and popular language, will find it here."—*Contemporary Review.*

"A useful book, containing many valuable explanations and much sound information; so that it will be found useful for school prizes, village libraries, and general parochial edification."—*Union Review.*

"We have here a sensible and compact little commentary on the Prayer Book, such as might well be put into the hands of pupil-teachers, national schoolmasters, or young people after confirmation."—*Literary Churchman.*

Now Ready, price 4s.; by Post, 4s. 3d.

The Ritual "Reason Why:"

A Simple Explanation of some 450 Ritual Observances. By the Author of "LITURGY of the CHURCH of SARUM." With copious Index.

"By far the best work we have seen from the pen of Mr. Walker. At a time like the present it is especially valuable."—*Church Review.*

"We should imagine that this book is destined to bear a conspicuous part in the great Ceremonial movement now going on around us. . . Written with great clearness; arranged with order and system; full of information, well compressed and unostentatiously put forth; it is a volume which more than any other with which we are acquainted, will be useful both to clergy and laity."—*Church News.*

"We know of no volume so admirably calculated to remove prejudice, to enlighten the partially-informed, and to direct enquirers into safe channels. No doubt it will become a standard authority."—*Union Review.*

"As a companion to the Service-books by Dr. F. G. Lee for the use of those who admire the ceremonial which their editor recommends, as well as for those who wish to be enlightened about it without adopting it, we may mention 'The Ritual Reason Why.'"—*Guardian.*

"An extremely valuable work. Its object is to give a concise *rationale* of Ceremonial worship. It is, in fact, a complete handbook of Ritualism. A copious index in no small degree adds to its value. Woodcuts are freely used, illustrating the vestments appertaining to public worship."—*Church Times.*

"It is a manual of the *rationale* of Symbolism and Ceremonialism, and Liturgicism, got together with very great pains and assiduity."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.

Just Published, 4to., Price 7s.; by Post, 7s. 5d.,

With Introduction by Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., of Clewer

DEDICATED, BY PERMISSION, TO

THE BISHOP OF SALISBURY.

THE

Liturgy of the Church of Saru

Translated from the Latin, and with an Introduction ar Explanatory Notes. By CHARLES WALKER, Author the "Ritual Reason Why."

"It is thoroughly deserving of careful attention. All who profes to follow the rule of the Church of England should strive to b Anglicans indeed. In such a strife they could not study a mor useful and practical book than that before us, to which Mr. Carte of Clewer, has prefixed a very appropriate Preface, and which i most gracefully and properly dedicated to the Bishop of Salisbury The Notes and Explanations throw a vast amount of light on th rules and directions of the Prayer Book."—*Union Review.*

"This, so far as we know, is the first complete version into Englis of the Sarum Liturgy—that is of Ordinary and Canon of the Mass as it existed and was used in England from the days immediately succeeding the Norman Conquest to the eve, or rather the morrow of the Reformation, to the accession, that is, of Edward VI., and from the accession to the death of Queen Mary. What that Liturgy was before the Conquest, say on the Dedication of S. Peter's, Westminster, we may well imagine from the knowledge we seem to have of S. Osmund. . . . Points there are, which publications, or rather republications, like this of Mr. Walker — for it is after all but an old friend under a new face—are calculated, and indeed intended, to press home upon us. Setting aside the grand doctrine of the Sacrifice, to which the 'Divine Liturgy' is an unerring, an unmistakeable witness, very many other points there are, interesting to an English churchman of to-day, upon which the book of ages past, the old Liturgy of Sarum, bears with a weight and a force of authority, all the more effective for being implied rather than imposed, and therefore acknowledged as that of a venerated counsellor, and accepted as that of a Divine guide. . . . One of the highest purposes which an early book can answer, is to supply the defects, explain the obscurities, and settle the uncertainties of a later; and it would be much cause of congratulation to Mr. Walker if, in translating the old Sarum Liturgy, he had contributed to amend, improve, and simplify, not the text, but the use of the English Church of to-day."—*Christian Remembrancer.*

J. T. HAYES, LYALL PLACE, EATON SQUARE.

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01185 4371